THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XVI JULY, 1941 NO. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE

Images in *The Faerie Queene* Drawn from Flora and Fauna ..... *Grace Warren Landrum* 131

The True Text of *King Lear* ..... *Leo Kirschbaum* 140

A Note on Wilson's *Hamlet* ..... *N. B. Allen* 154

"Making the Green One Red" ..... *Russell K. Alspach* 166

Hamlet and the Gonzago Murders ..... *Samuel A. Tannenbaum* 169

The Relation between *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and Jonson's *Every Man is His Humour* ..... *Sallie Sewell* 175

Communication: Portia, Daniel, Susanna ..... *John E. Hannigan* 190

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

ERRATA

Page 138, line 17 should follow line 9
Page 144, line 3 should follow line 6
Page 150, line 6 should follow line 7
Page 156, line 23 should follow line 13
Page 160, line 10 should follow line 3
Page 171, lines 17 and 18 should follow line 7

These errors, resulting from the mischief of a discharged employee, will be corrected in the reprints.

IMAGES IN *THE FAERIE QUEENE* DRAWN FROM FLORA AND FAUNA

By GRACE WARREN LANDRUM

(*Concluded*)

The eagle, almost the sole bird surviving figuratively in the modern world, is of course symbolical in Spenser as in the mediæval bestiaries. He is not only triumphant over prey, but lordly, raising his plumes at sight of a victim, rising fresh from the ocean, his eyes able to face the sun so steadily that Contemplation is likened to him.[98] The plumes of the Great Dragon are like an eagle's. Duessa's claws are those of an eagle.

Birds collectively in splendid gardens and individually on the wing charmed the poet. From generalizations of birds "glad of joyous Pryme," well worn after Chaucer's "as fayne as fowel is of the brighte sonne," he passes to the bird "glad of tempest gon," signifying Florimel's desire for rest in the witch's hut.[99] He uses *nest* figuratively, sometimes only for a rime. Malbecco "mewes" Hellenore from all men's sight.[100] Spenser rings the changes on the usual Elizabethan comparisons involving the dove. Though one expression brought extravagant praise from Leigh Hunt,[101] the figures scarcely deserve listing. To continue, the peacock signifies the rich beauty of the image under the altar in the House of Busirane,[102] and again the ludicrous pride of Braggadocchio.[103] The disciples of Cymœnt are as swift as a swallow.[104] Talus pursues with the speed of a swallow. The course of Phædria's shallop is likewise compared. The messenger of Morpheus is "light as a chearefull larke."[105] Phædria's song is as loud as a lark's. Diana's flight from the Faun is like that of a "darred lark." The plumes of "painted jays" are mentioned.[106] Chaunticleer is the "native belman of the night," that "rings his silver bell to every sleepy wight."[107] The "crane's stately stalking" symbolizes "overweening pride";[108] his neck typifies Gluttony.[109] A withered skin is like a "dryed rooke."[110] Nocturnal birds were repellant to Spenser (as the *Epithalamion* proves):

"Even all the nation of unfortunate
And fatall birds about them flocked were,
Such as by nature men abhorre and hate,
The ill-faste Owle, deaths dreadfull messengere,
The hoars Night-raven, trump of dolefull drere,
The lether-winged Bat, dayes enimy,
The ruefull Strich still waiting on the bere,
The Whistler shrill, that who so heares, doth dy,
The hellish Harpies, prophets of sad destiny."[111]

Osgood notes the figures concerning bait as "one of Spenser's characteristic images." It occurs no less than twenty-six times. He was evidently a devoted angler.[112] Brief metaphors involve "glorious bait," "bounteous baytes," "to illude him with such bait," "guileful bait," "bait of bestiall delight," the "pleasing bait of poetry." In a longer metaphor Clarinda is a "foolish maid," "heedless of the hooke."[113] The expressive "subtill nets" coupled with "engins of wit"[114] probably but not necessarily concerns fishing. Despite the frequency of figures from angling, one is surprised that no fish are specifically named. He is thus in sharp contrast with Shakspere, who mentions carp, cod, dace, luce, pike, trout, salmon.[115] Since Spenser is remarkably specific in figures from game birds, I incline to think he was less interested in fishing than in hunting, however more congenial the gentler sport might seem to have been.

Trapping is mentioned, naturally, of course. It is unimportant to visualize the particular game to be ensnared. Perhaps Spenser had never set traps for moles, but he did not forget them. In the delightfully prolix catalogue of English rivers, where he becomes even a sportive punster, he writes of the

"Mole that like a nousling Mole doth make
His way still under ground till Thamis be overtake."[116]

Few poets one would like to visualize more surely than Spenser at Kilcolman. The landscape today justifies his enthusiasm; the charming ruins at Buttevant suggest much, but an actual day with the poet, not in litigation with Lord Rocke, but (presumably) supervising cattle, sheep, and swine on his three thousand acres, would be revealing.

In figures based on cattle Spenser has given almost the life story of creatures peculiarly important in Irish folk-

lore (whether or not Spenser chanced to know it). The braying of Orgoglio is like the noise of bulls:

> "He loudly brayd with beastly yelling shoud,
> That all the fields rebellowed againe;
> As great a noyse, as when in Cymbrian plaine
> An heard of Bulles, whom kindly rage doth sting,
> Do for the milkie mothers want complaine,
> And fill the fields with troublous bellowing,
> The neighbour woods around with hollow murmur ring."[117]

Similarly, Adicia, wife of the Sultan, is

> "like an enraged cow
> That is berobbed of her younglings dere."

From the passive beast "appointed for the stall" he draws a simile. His figure of the cud of sweet and bitter fancy is the "cud of griefe and inward pain,"[118] and the "cud of lover's carefull plight."[119] Likewise, a vivid scene of the breaking of a steer depicts the struggle of Disdain and Scorn against "a gentle squire."[120] Spenser sees steers "astonished by a beast of strange and forraine race" in their midst.[121] Scudamour is

> "like to a mazed steare
> That yet of mortalls stroke the stound doth beare."[122]

Combats between knights are likened to encounters of fierce bulls. Bull-baiting, of course, appears figuratively.[123] The madness of Furor is likened to that of the blindfold bull. Classic scenes also recur to Spenser. Marinell, unhorsed by Britomart, is like the ox garlanded for sacrifice.[124] The Blatant Beast subdued by Calidore is like a bullock "felled to ground by butcher's hand."[125] A figure of literary effort completed appears in Stanza 45 of the first edition of Book III:[126]

> "But now my teme begins to faint and fayle,
> All woxen weary of their journall toyle:
> Therefore I will their sweated yokes assayle
> At this same furrowes end, till a new day."

Spenser has done more than re-echo contemporary conventional pastoralism. Una's lamb, Biblical, not classical in origin, counts high among symbolic animals. Far more realistic are figures of the "trembling lamb";[127] of Una's emotion when pursued, like that of a lamb seized by a wolf;[128] of the closeness of younglings to their dam;[129] of

rams in conflict, signifying the combat of Redcross and the Sarazin;[130] of a crowd running "like sheep in narrow fold."[131]. The sight of scattered sheep motivated several comparisons.[132] Babes are slain as "sheep out of the fold."[133] Throughout these figures Spenser is convincing, as he is also in mentions of wild goats. Similes drawn from their movements have evoked praise from commentators, who have traced them to Ariosto.[134] The goat as a symbol of Lechery is, of course, a stock figure.

Gluttony in the procession to the House of Pride is, obviously, mounted on swine. To the tusks of a boar are likened the teeth of lust. The crest of the Great Dragon is like the upreared bristles of a "chauffed boar." Satyrane and Sansloy in conflict resemble wild boars.[135] A homely picture, that of November in the Pageant of the Months, suggests the hog-killing of a Virginia plantation today:

> "Next was November, he full grosse and fat,
> As fed with lard, and that right well might seeme;
> For, he had been a fatting hogs of late,
> That yet his browes with sweat did reek and steem."[136]

Spenser, with a gift for capturing beauty in motion, is naturally attracted by the swiftness of the stag. The flight of Florimel from the Witch's Son is like that of a hind.[137] A nymph flees in similar fashion. Amoret in flight from Lust leaps "like a roe buck light."[138] Scudamour holds the hand of Amoret with the shyness of "warie Hynd within the weedie soyle."[139]. The distinctiveness of the similes is a lurking sympathy for the animal in distress, as in these homely, effective lines describing Marin's love of Florimel:

> "In this sad plight he walked here and there,
> And romed round about the rocke in vaine,
> As he had lost himselfe, he wist not where;
> Oft listening if he mote her heare againe;
> And still bemoaning her unworthy paine.
> Like as an Hynde whose calfe is falne unwares
> Into some pit, where she him heares complaine,
> An hundred times about the pit side fares,
> Right sorrowfully mourning her bereaved cares."[140]

Spenser fancies the relief of the thirsty hind

> "that greedily embayes
> In the cool soile."[141]

To conclude, Amavia expires

> "As gentle Hynd, whose sides with cruell steele
> Though launched, forth her bleeding life does raine,
> Whiles the sad pang approaching she does feele,
> Brayes out her latest breath, and up her eyes doth seele."[142]

Bears and wolves must have been prowlers familiar to the residents of Kilcolman. The bear obviously suggests greed and ferocity. The wrath of Radigund is like that of a bear that seizes with "cruell claws"

> "Upon the carkasse of some beast too weake,
> Proudly stands over, and a while doth pause
> To hear the piteous beast pleading her plaintiffe cause."[143]

Calidore upon the loss of Pastorello is like a bear whose whelps have been stolen.[144] There is an odd touch in the mention of a bear's "uneven paw." Another figure suggests a scene the English poet might have witnessed, the bear seeking honeycomb and frightened away by dogs.[145] Remembrances of pastimes on the Bankside, possibly fresh Irish experiences, are involved in figures drawn from bear baiting, as in these powerful lines:

> "So mightily the British Prince him rouzd
> Out of his hold, and broke his captive bands,
> And as a Beare whom angry curres have touzd,
> Having off-shakt them, and escapt their hands,
> Becomes more fell, and all that him withstands
> Treads downe and overthrows."[146]

Wolves are mentioned less often, and quite conventionally, but there is a striking simile of the combat of Satyrane and Cambell,

> "As when two greedy wolves breake by force
> Into an heard far from the husband farm,"[147]

paralleled by a passage in the *Iliad,* but lifelike enough to be an incident seen by Spenser or reported by a frightened Munster shepherd.

Spenser's interest in snakes, necessarily only reminiscent of England after 1579, or purely literary, is little concerned with the outward appearance, except in the exquisite simile of elusive beauty of gold so woven into an arras that

> "the rich metall lurkëd privily
> As faining to be hid from envious eye;

> Yet here, and there, and everywhere unwares
> It shewed itself and shone unwillingly;
> Like a discolored snake, whose hidden snares
> Through the greene gras his long bright burnished
> back declares."[148]

Malæger is cold and dreary as a snake.[149] Despair, " a man of hell," creeps toward Sir Trevisan "as close as snake in hidden weeds."[150] Human behavior is frequently marked by serpentine qualities:

> "like the stings of asps that kill with smart
> Her [Slander's] spiteful words did prick
> and wound the inner part."[151]

The lascivious glance of Cymocles is like an adder "lurking in the weeds."[152] The sight of Florimel unfixt a "secret sting of greedy lust" in Braggadocchio.[154] Grief and fury have a mortal sting.[154] A stanza of emotional power, almost Shaksperian, likens jealousy to a snake: "O hateful hellish Snake."[155] Again, "pleasing words" are like to the magical art of the snake charming never so wisely.[156] The serpent symbolizes the healing power of faith in the House of Holiness,[157] but classical conceptions are frequent. A fine Virgilian effect describes Cambello:

> "So fresh he seemed and so fierce in sight;
> Like as a Snake, whom wearie winter's teene
> Hath worn to naught, now feeling sommers night,
> Casts off his ragged skin and freshly doth him dight."[158]

Cambina's "rod of peace" is like that which "Maias sonne doth wield."[159] The eyes of a knight are like those of a Basilisk.[160]

Creatures rarely yet effectively mentioned are the eyeless toads and frogs Error vomits forth; the toad chewed by Envy mounted on the wolf in the pageantry of the House of Pride; the ears of "elephants by Indus flood," on the head of the lustful savage pursuing Amoret; Malbecco's ape; the chameleon representing Duessa's wiles; the camel ridden by Avarice, symbol of Oriental riches; the hyena which the Witch's Son resembles; the inevitable crocodile, whose false tears, like Duessa's, are described in an elaborate simile.

The lion caught Spenser's imagination as it had that of

many a predecessor and contemporary. That he may have seen the beast in the Tower is by no means unlikely. (Chaucer himself had such an opportunity.) The numerous similes and metaphors are chiefly too stereotyped for comment. Folk lore continues, as in the case of the noble creature that guards Una until he dies beside her, pierced by the deadly iron brand of Sansloy.[161] Rather individual is the comparison of Calidore striking among thieves like a lion "amongst a herd of deer."[162] Likewise, the freezing astonishment of Guyon at sight of slaughtered Mordaunt warms with the power of a "Lyon grudging in his great disdain."[163] Artegal rousing himself for battle is

> "Like as a Lyon that in drowsie cave
> Hath long time slept."[164]

A lion symbolizes William the Conqueror.[165] The face of "the great dame nature" did like a lion show, too powerful for some eyes, though reported by other beholders as of beauty far surpassing that of the sun.[166] The lion consorts with the lamb, as in *Isaiah,* fights with the unicorn in traditional fashion, and struggles with a tiger in the vivid conflict of Britomart and Radigund.[167]

Osgood has remarked Spenser's tiger as exceptionally ferocious,[168] and thus opposed to the lion, "a noble beast."[169] The grief of the Squire of Low Degree is enough to pierce the heart of tigers and bears.[170] Cambell and Diamond fight like "tigers over prey." Britomart and Radigund in combat are like a tiger and a lioness met at "spoyling of some hungry prey."[171] The tiger in flight is imaginatively described:

> "For as the wingëd wind his Tigre fled,
> That view of eye could scarce him overtake,
> Ne scarse his feet on ground were seene to tred;
> Through hils and dales he speedie way did make,
> Ne hedge ne ditch his readie passage brake."[172]

Again, blows of Huddibras and Sansloy against Guyon are like those of a bear and tiger in conflict, a strange pair, according to Upton.[173] Finally, the tiger pursuing Pastorella has a "greedy mouth," wide-gaping "like hell-gate," a scene that suggests the vanished Scripture play.[174]

It is beyond my purpose to discuss conceptions of the

fabulous animals in the *Faerie Queene.* Suffice it to say that Spenser probably knew as much about them as both his unlettered and sophisticated contemporaries.[175] Cameleon, basilisk or cockatrice, crocodile, griffin, unicorn, phoenix doubtless fascinated his Elizabethan mind. Philosophy today has clipped the wings not only of angels but of fantastic animal creatures in an age when curiosity may be satisfied in scores of scientifically catalogued zoological gardens. Only a word is needed as to Spenser's fancy for and *monstrous,* words colorless to us but to them vaguely charming and at least slightly concrete. Even love as a "monster fell" connoted more than in modern parlance. Simpler conceptions of the abnormal, giant or "ghastly bug," terrifying forms, may be mentioned, besides the complex, grotesque dragon, Error, and the splendid dragon slain by Redcross as his crowning achievement, the Monster monsters. Like Shakspere, he is extremely fond of *monster* under the Altar in Book V, and the Blatant Monster of the thousand tongues derived from half a dozen kinds of animals. Much investigation of these creatures and their literary origins has been industriously made and need not be summarized in a paper which concerns animal life only as provocative of figures. I have omitted also the great, fundamental allegorization based on animals, of which the Ape in *Mother Hubbard's Tale* is a most striking symbol.[176] A few final generalizations on animal life may be added, too vague for classification: the "biting sword"; "bite of cursed steel";[177] devouring spear";[178] "bitter byting grief"; "chawing vengeance"; "the untamed heart."

If Spenser sees at times conventionally, comparison with his contemporaries supports him. Their interest in observation differed entirely from the sentimentalizing of animals in our Romantic period. It was much closer to the allegorization of the bestiaries, the days of grotesque gargoyles on cathedrals, and very far from the modern delight in fearful symmetry as sculptured by Paul Bartlett, a Borglum, or Matilda Hoffman. Nevertheless, unreal as much of Elizabethan animal lore was, it implied a closeness to bird and beast which has faded today as a source of metaphor.[179] Surely few poets have so delighted as Spenser in the terrible sight of splendid creatures in action, or perhaps suffered so much at fearsome sounds in lonely wilds,

destined as he was, more than any other great English poet, to a savagely romantic region for the superb accomplishment of a literary life.

College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Va.

[98]*Ibid.*, I, 10, 47, 6. [99]*Ibid.*, III, 7, 10, 9. [100]*Ibid.*, III, 9, 5, 8.
[101]*Variorum* I, 288. [102]*FQ* III, 11, 47, 6-7. [103]*Ibid.*, II, 3, 6, 3-5.
[104]*Ibid.*, III, 4, 33, 5.

For Shakspere's special interest in the flight of birds, see Spurgeon, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[105]*FQ*, I, 1, 44, 6-7. [106]*Ibid.*, II, 8, 5, 8. [107]*Ibid.*, V, 6, 27, 1-4.
[108]*Ibid.*, VI, 7, 42, 5-6. [109]*Ibid.*, 1, 4, 21, 5 [110]*Ibid.*, II, 11, 23, 3.
[111]*Ibid.*, 11, 12, 36. [112]*Variorum* V, 206. [113]*FQ*, V, 5, 43, 1-3.
[114]*Ibid.*, V, 5, 52, 1-2.

[115]Spurgeon, *op. cit.*, (pp. 99-100) believes Shakspere had no specific knowledge of fishing, a strange conclusion in my opinion.

[116]*FQ*, IV, 11, 32, 9. [117]*Ibid.*, I, 8, 11, 3-9. [118]*Ibid.*, V, 6, 19, 2.
[119]*Ibid.*, V, 2, 27, 2. [120]*Ibid.*, VI, 8, 12, 1-5. [121]*Ibid.*, VII, 6, 28, 7-8.
[122]*Ibid.*, IV, 6, 37, 4-5. [123]*Ibid.*, II, 8, 42, 1-7

[124]*Ibid.*, III, 4, 17. See *Variorum* III, 239, for Upton's praise of Spenser's felicity and Z. E. Green, "Observations on the Epic Similes in the *Faerie Queene*," *Philological Quarterly*, XIV, 3, (July, 1935), p. 224, for praise of the simile as one of the most magnificent figures of speech in the whole poem.

[125]*FQ* VI, 12, 30, 7-9. [126]*Oxford Spenser*, p. 210. [127]*FQ* III, 7, 36, 6.
[128]*Ibid.*, I, 5, 10; *Variorum* I, 240, 241.

[129]Perhaps the phrase is not applicable to sheep, and yet may be, possibly suggested by I Peter 1: 19 .

[130]*FQ*, 1, 2, 16. See Z. E. Green, *op. cit.*, p. 220, for praise of the simile as well-proportioned.

[131]*FQ* IV, 3, 41, 4-5.
[132]*Ibid.*, II, 9, 4, 6-7; V, 4, 44, 7-9; V, 6, 30, 6; VI, 8, 36, 8.
[133]*Ibid.*, I, 8, 35, 5-7. [134]*Variorum* III, 286-7; V, 232.
[135]*FQ*, I, 6, 44, 3-9. [136]*Ibid.*, VII, 7, 40, 1-4. [137]*Ibid.*, III, 7, 1, 1-6
[138]*Ibid.*, IV, 7, 22, 2. [139]*Ibid.*, IV, 10, 55, 8.
[140]*Ibid.*, IV, 12, 17. See *Variorum* IV, 277-8 for Warton's comment.
[141]*FQ* III, 12, 44, as in the first edition; *Oxford Spenser*, p. 210.
[142]*Ibid.*, II, 1, 38, 6-9. [143]*Ibid.*, V, 4, 40, 6-9. [144]*Ibid.*, VI, 11, 25, 8-9.
[145]*Ibid.*, III, 10, 53, 4-9; *Variorum* III, 287.
[146]*Ibid.*, II, 11, 33, 3-6. [147]*Ibid.*, IV, 4, 35, 6-7.
[148]*Ibid.*, III, 11, 28, 4-9; *Variorum* III, 282, quotes Lowell's enthusiastic comment.
[149]*FQ*, II, 11, 22, 4. [150]*Ibid.*, I, 9, 28, 8. [151]*Ibid.*, IV, 8, 26, 8-9.
[152]*Ibid.*, II, 5, 34, 1-2. [153]*Ibid.*, III, 8, 25, 2. [154]*Ibid.*, II, 4, 33, 5.
[155]*Ibid.*, III, 11, 1. [156]*Ibid.*, III, 2, 15, 5-6 [157]*Ibid.*, I, 10, 13, 4-6.
[158]*Ibid.*, IV, 3, 42, 1, 6. [159]*Ibid.*, IV, 3, 42, 1, 6. [160]*Ibid.*, IV, 8, 39, 7.
[161]*Variorum*, I, 207. [162]*FQ*, VI, 11, 49, 1-5. [163]*Ibid.*, II, 1, 42, 6.
[164]*Ibid.*, III, 3, 30, 1-2. [165]*Ibid.*, III, 3, 47.
[166]*Ibid.*, VII, 7, 6, 4-9. [167]*Ibid.*, V, 7, 30.
[168]*Modern Language Notes*, XLVI, 1933, p. 505.
[169]See Winstanley's comment, *Variorum* II, 235.
[170]*FQ*, IV, 8, 4, 9. [171]*Ibid.*, V, 7, 30, 2. [172]*Ibid.*, II, 11, 26, 1-6.
[173]*Variorum* II, 198-9. [174]*FQ* VI, 10, 34, 6.

[175]See H. W. Seager, *Natural History in Shakespeare's Time* (London, 1896), p. vi, for mention of Batman's *Liber de Proprietatibus*, the leading popular treatise of the day. See also Emma Phipson, *Animal Lore of Shakespeare's Time* (1883).

[176]See A. B. Lieble, *Conventions of Animal Symbolism in Mother Hubbards Tale*, unpublished doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago.

[177]*Variorum* II, 247. Jortin derives this from Libullus, but idea of the bite is Spenser's.

[178]*Ibid.*, I, 256, gives a source.

[179]See G. L. Kittredge, *Words and Their Ways in English Speech* (1908), p. 361-2.

THE TRUE TEXT OF *KING LEAR**

By LEO KIRSCHBAUM

TEXTUAL criticism is not an end in itself. Its purpose is the setting-forth of a given text as the author wished that text set forth. It is not a science but an art. The late R. B. McKerrow put the *caveat* and the *apologia* for textual criticism succinctly in his Preface to *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare:*

> Indeed, when we sum up the whole matter, we shall, I think, find that the editing of an old text, however much it may call for literary appreciation and imagination, must in the first place be based upon the most careful research into surviving evidence, and that, however much it may depend for its foundations upon that kind of common sense which some would dignify by the name of 'science', it is also, and perhaps in all its finer achievements, of the nature of an art.[1]

The textual critic employs taste constantly in his operations. Conversely, the textual critic utilizes all the available evidence before he presents his reading for acceptance. What one prefers is beside the point. What is to the point is what a careful study of the texts indicates. Furthermore, in textual criticism there are many methods and many kinds of evidence. At all times, one tries to establish as high a degree of probability as is possible. When one is done, one cannot say: Here is what Shakspere wrote. One can, at best, say: This is probably what Shakspere wrote. With these preliminary remarks, I proceed to the problem of the text of *King Lear.*

The two texts which modern scholars employ in their reconstruction of the play as Shakspere wrote it are the First Quarto of 1608 and the First Folio of 1623. Each omits lines which the other has: Q about 100 lines found in F, and F about 300 lines, including IV. iii, found in Q^2. The two texts differ constantly in those passages which they have in common—much less than Q1 and Q2 of *Hamlet,* much more than Q and F of *Troilus and Cressida.* How puzzling the problem of the two texts is may be illustrated by Kittredge's recent statement:

*This article represents the introductory chapter and two textual analyses from a forthcoming book.

> The differences between the Quarto and the Folio by no means warrant the theory that Shakespeare ever re-wrote his *King Lear* or subjected it to a substantial revision.
>
> As for the exact nature of the 'copy' which the printer of the Quarto or the printer of the Folio used, or for its relation, in each case, to the Globe prompt book, nothing short of revelation will ever enlighten us.[3]

But Greg, in a recent monograph which represents the first serious and sustained attempt to grapple with one category of problems which editing of the play presents, refuses to look at the matter as does Kittredge:

> There is no disguising the fact that editors have left the textual criticism of *King Lear* in a thoroughly unsatisfactory state, indeed one is almost tempted to say that no work worth mentioning has hitherto been done on the subject. This is hardly surprising seeing that the necessary apparatus was not available. I believe that now the whole of the information needed is at the disposal of editors, and it appears to be high time that they set about the job of preparing a text of the play that shall be based upon a properly reasoned estimate of the evidence.[4]

The present study, therefore, cannot escape the nature of being an answer to a double challenge. I agree with Greg that the *textus receptus* is highly unsatisfactory. I hope that I can show how we may establish a text which will represent a return to Shakspere.

Some of the problems in the inquiry appear to be chiefly of bibliographical interest. Yet their solution provides the groundwork of the solution to the textual problem. I shall enlarge upon this later. To begin with, we must recognize that there is no such thing as *a* quarto text. As so often happened in those days, the sheets of Q were corrected while the book was a-printing. But the uncorrected sheets were not discarded. They were mixed and used indiscriminately with the corrected sheets. Thus, out of the twelve extant copies of Q, some have *this* sheet in corrected state and *that* sheet in uncorrected state. There is this peculiarity, that of a given sheet only one forme has been corrected, either the inner or the outer, never both.[5] The inner formes of C, F, H and the outer formes of D, E, G, K were corrected and are thus found in two states; sheets B, I, L are invariant in the extant copies of Q. Greg's *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'* contains an admirably thorough dis-

cussion of these different readings. At all times Greg's end is the establishment of the true text.[6]

The whole problem of the editing of *King Lear,* the entire question of the *textus receptus*, hinges on a utilizable solution to the problem of the relationship of Q and F. We have already seen Kittredge's disbelief in a possible solution. Chambers[7] and Greg,[8] however, consider Q a bad quarto. Both believe it a shorthand transcript from performance. Doran holds that the "first quarto represents Shakespeare's original manuscript, extensively revised, and that the folio represents a transcript of the original, abridged, somewhat revised, marked by the censor, used in the theater as a prompt-book, and finally used as the master copy by the printers of the First Folio."[9] Van Dam states that Q is "far superior to the F version," that it "belongs to the class of printed plays nearest to Shakespeare's originals," and that F represents "the revised prompt-book, one remove farther from Shakespeare's original than the prompt-book text which served as copy for the Q."[10]

What evidence has been offered that Q is a reported text, a bad quarto? Chambers writes:

> The texts are substantially derived from the same original. There are a good many verbal variants . . . Q seems to contain some 'connective' phrases by actors, and many of its misreadings might well be due either to actors' blunders or to mishearing . . . Mislineation is a constant feature in Q . . . Occasionally it is altogether unmetrical. Prose is printed as verse. Still more often is verse printed as prose . . . Moreover, Q has practically no punctuation except commas, even in places where both logic and enunciation require heavier stops and these are supplied by F. I think that the characteristics of Q point to a reported text. It is, of course, a much better version than the bad Quartos of *2, 3 Henry VI, Romeo and Juliet, Henry V, Merry Wives,* and *Hamlet.* In particular it does not displace bits of dialogue within a scene, or bring in bits from other scenes or other plays. Possibly it was produced by shorthand and not memorization. The reporter, except for subconscious substitutions by himself or the actors, has not got his words badly. The failure is in putting his continuous notes into metre, and in punctuating them. And these tasks he seems to have largely shirked . . .
>
> Apart from iii. 2. 79-95, most of the Q omissions might well be errors. They leave *lacunae* of sense or action at i. 1. 41-6, i. 2.

118-24, ii. 4. 142-7, iv. 1. 6-9, iv. 6. 169-74. In a reported text, actors, reporter, and printer may all have contributed. Identical line-ends have led to mistakes at i. 1. 90 and iii. 4. 18. Probably the reporter's lapses of attention are mainly responsible, and some linked omissions (ii. 4. 99-100, 104; iii. 4. 26-7, 37-8) and small contextual alterations suggest that he was sometimes aware of these, and attempted to cover them up. On the other hand, there is some political and social criticism in the play, and it is conceivable that the omission of i. 2. 118-24 and iv. 6. 169-74 and also of iii. 1. 22-9 may have been directed by a censor.[11]

I now quote Greg's analysis of the Q-F relationship in his well-known article, "The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism Illustrated in a Study of the Text of *King Lear*":

The main features of the Quarto text appear to be as follows: in outward form, misrepresentation of the metrical structure, and defective and misleading punctuation; textually, constant redundancy of expression, and persistent substitution of another (and generally inferior) reading for that of the Folio. . . .

To pass to textual features: by redundancy I understand the expansion and dilution of the text, on the one hand by the introduction of exclamations, expletives, vocatives, and connective words generally, on the other hand by the use of looser and less close-knit phrasing. Such redundancy is characteristic of actors and is a marked feature of reported texts. . . .

Both forms of redundancy are united in this typical example (I. i. 70-1):

F I am made of that selfe-mettle as my Sister,

Q Sir I am made of the selfe same mettall that my sister is, . . .

Or, for flabby and vicious phrasing, take (II. iv. 225):

F Or rather a disease that's in my flesh,

Q Or rather a disease that lies within my flesh,

and for the intrusion of connective phrases (I. iv. 332-3):

F *Lear* . . . Thou shalt finde,
That Ile resume the shape which thou dost thinke
I haue cast off for euer [*Q*, thou shalt I warrant thee].
Gon. Do you marke that [*Q* my Lord]?

In all these cases the Quarto is condemned by the verse. Moreover, these connectives tend to be borrowed or repeated from other passages, such assimilation being another common trick of actors. In the first scene Lear twice admonishes Cordelia (I. i. 92, 96):

Nothing will come of nothing, speake againe

and later:

How, how *Cordelia?* Mend your speech a little, . . .

The Quarto borrows "How" from the second to prefix unmetrically to the first, and gives the second in the form:

Goe to, goe to, mend your speech a little,

introducing a fretful exclamation, more in the style of Polonius than of Lear, which it employs again unmetrically later on. Similarly the Quarto makes Lear conclude two consecutive speeches with the words "goe, goe, my people", whereas in the second case the Folio has "Away, away" (I. iv. 294, 311); and while in the Folio Lear cries once "Yet haue I left a daughter," and later, "I haue another daughter", the Quarto uses the first phrase on both occasions (I, 276, 327). There are also some traces of actors' exaggerations and bombast.

The reporter reveals his presence by a number of mistakes of hearing, such as "a dogge, so bade in office" for "a Dogg's obey'd in Office" (IV. vi. 163), and

striuing to better ought, we marre whats well

instead of

striuing to better, oft we marre what's well,

which is puzzling till we remember that Shakespeare rimes *oft* and *nought* (I. iv. 369) . . . Further traces of the reporter are a number of speeches assigned to the wrong character, and sometimes modified to suit. For instance, where in the Folio Regan says to Edmund (V. iii. 81):

Let the Drum strike, and proue my title thine

in the Quarto it is Edmund himself who says:

Let the drum strike, and proue my title good

as if a drum could prove anything but its power of making a noise. It is also significant that inarticulate sounds and meaningless refrains indicated in the Folio, are in the Quarto either omitted (I. ii. 149, III. iv. 59, IV. vi. 207) or quite otherwise expressed, as when "Do, de, de, de: sese" becomes "loudla doodla" (III. vi. 77).

But it is the verbal variants of the two texts that supply the most ample evidence of reporting. Such changes must inevitably occur on the stage, and the substituted word will be either indifferent or generally inferior. That this is what we observe in the Quarto text is agreed, but Miss Doran points out, pertinently enough, that indifferent variants may be the unconscious substitutions of a compositor or a copyist, while superior Folio readings may be due to revision. Now, theoretically this is perhaps a sufficient answer, but when we come to examine actual examples I think that it breaks down in practice. For one thing, the indifferent, or nearly indifferent, variants are rather numerous to father upon one transcriber and two compositors; for another, some superficially indifferent variants prove to be in fact due to repetition and thus suggest actors' assimilations; and lastly some are not isolated but consciously linked. When, in the line (I. i. 186):

That iustly think'st, and hast most rightly said:

the Quarto transposes the words "iustly" and 'rightly", the blunder is perhaps not beyond the range of original sin latent in a copyist:

but when, two lines apart, we find "Fiue dayes . . . And on the sixt," consistently varied to "Foure" and "fift", this explanation becomes less satisfactory. (I. i. 176, 178). And so it is with revision. There may be cases—many cases—in which it is impossible to distinguish between corruption on the one hand or revision on the other. But I question whether this is always, or even generally, so. Where one reading is metrical and the other not; where in one the thought receives natural expression, in the other forced or inept; or where one shows a misunderstanding of the sense that is clear in the other, we have, I think, good and sufficient ground for judging.

To set forth the evidence in detail would need no less than a complete textual commentary on the play. I can do no more than select an example here and there from the cloud of witnesses. Here is a passage condemned by the metre. The Folio reads (I, ii. 10):

> Why brand they vs
> With Base? With basenes Bastardie? Base, Base?

The verse is correct, but the second is not an easy line to remember exactly, and it is hardly surprising to find in the Quarto no more than the unmetrical syncopation

> with base, base bastardie?

At one point Oswald says of Gloucester (IV. v. 40):

> Would I could meet [him] Madam, I should shew
> What party I do follow.

The Quarto reads "What Lady I doe follow", and since the talk has been of the rivalry between Regan and Goneril this would come naturally to the lips of an actor, but it is not to that that the Steward is referring. Or consider the lines in which Lear breaks forth in true Shakspearian phrase (III. ii. 58):

> Close pent-vp guilts,
> Riue your concealing Continents, and cry
> These dreadful! Summoners grace.

The Quarto's "riue your concealed centers" makes neither verse nor sense. Once more: Regan observes, shrewdly enough, of the blinded Gloucester (IV, v. 10):

> Where he arriues, he moues
> All hearts against vs: *Edmund,* I thinke is gone
> In pitty of his misery, to dispatch
> His nighted life: Moreouer to descry
> The strength o' th' Enemy.

When, in place of *"Edmund",* the Quarto reads "and now", it makes the following lines refer to Gloucester, which, remembering his attempted suicide in the next scene, might appear not unreasonable to an actor who overlooked the fact that it further credits the corpse with the purpose of spying on the French army! Failure of memory alone can account for a final example (I. i. 85-7.). When in the first scene Lear at last turns to Cordelia, he addresses her in the tender words:

> Now our Ioy,
> Although our last and least; to whose yong loue
> The Vines of France, the Milke of Burgundie,
> Striue to be interest.
> In place of this the Quarto has only:
> but now our ioy,
> Although the last, not least in our deere loue,
> where it is surely the loss of a line and a half that has occasioned the reconstruction. If anybody can see revision in this passage his conception of poetical composition must be radically different from my own. . . .
>
> Miss Doran has argued that the Quarto text is far too good to be reported, and she is able to point with considerable force to the very different textual conditions found in admittedly reported texts, such as the earliest print of *Romeo and Juliet*. But I think that it is now agreed by most critics that these are what are called memorial reconstructions. This the quarto of *Lear* emphatically is not. If it is indeed a reported text it must have been taken down by shorthand . . .[12]

Greg's well-known essay was a trail-blazing one. It may be said to be the first real attempt to deal with the problem of editing the play. However, has not Greg hampered his own inquiries and those of other interested scholars? On the one hand, he points out the following kinds of mnemonic error in Q: repetition, addition, assimilation, anticipation, recollection, mishearing, wrong ascription, transposition, substitution, misunderstanding, telescoping, restatement, *etc.* On the other hand, he insists that Q is not a memorial reconstruction. What prevents Greg from doing with parallel Q-F what he did so superbly with *Orlando Furioso* and Orlando's extant part in his *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements.*[13] To indicate that Q contains constant examples of faulty memory and then to hamstring the inquiry because of a hypothesis for provenance (*i.e.,* shorthand) seems to me wrong. To hold that Q stems from performance is to give it a quasi-authority which it certainly does not possess. Before any hypotheses concerning origin are raised, a full explanation of the bad memory hypothesis is obviously indicated. The deterrent so far has been, it would seem, that Q is not as outrageously apparent a memorial corruption as the bad quarto of *Romeo and Juliet.* Yet Greg himself has stated that the latter has passages "that are at least as good as any in the quarto of *Lear.*"[14] Furthermore, although the Q-F relationship of *Richard III* is, as Patrick has pointed out,[15] one of memorial corruption, the quarto of

this play is, *apparently,* better than the quarto of *King Lear!* It seems worthwhile to show in some detail in the present study that Q is a constant memorial corruption of the text of F. If I can show that this is so, then editors of *King* Lear will at last have a distinction made between a text with authority and a text without authority.

But the superior authority of F can be satisfactorily established on grounds other than textual comparison. This is surprising—but it is true. That F was printed from a copy of Q which had been emended by reference to a transcript is bibliographically demonstrable.[16] The 1623 Folio being what it is, the conclusion is inescapable that this transcript derived from Shakspere's fellows. Hence, as Greg has pointed out, when Q and F agree, there is less warrant for the reading than when they differ, for there may be concurrence of error.[17] But much more of this point should be made than Greg has made. In fact, it is right to say that the whole editorial policy toward the text of *King Lear* might rest on this bibliographical relationship between F and Q. It must be reiterated again and again—until every editor of Shakspere takes note—that when F differs from Q, someone has made a deliberate change on a leaf of Q; that this someone was connected with Shakspere's company[18], that he must have made the change by reference to a manuscript ultimately deriving from Shakspere himself; that this someone scrupulously adhered to this manuscript if the hundreds of changes, small and great, which he made on Q's leaves are taken into account.[19] When one sees this unknown again and again substituting for the Q word a word which is not *obviously better,* which on the basis of taste may be considered worse, one gets a clear and true picture of this unknown's integrity. Truly, we owe a great debt to him. And our respect for Heminge and Condell tends correspondingly to increase.

Someone with authority purposefully changed Q by reference to a playhouse manuscript. One wonders how future editors of *King Lear* can be as careless and carefree in their reliance on Q as past editors have been. That Q's corruption can be demonstrated need not *necessarily,* as I have suggested, enter into the matter. That F changes Q, that behind these changes looms Shakspere himself, should be

enough of a warning to the editor who hankers for a Q reading as over against a F reading. What this editor is doing, in short, is preferring a reading which someone with authority of the King's Men, using a transcript going directly back to Shakspere, has rejected. In a way, therefore, it is fortunate that F's text is the result of a quasi-palimpsest. The differences between Q and F are thus seen to be dynamically purposive. Where the two texts differ, the F reading *must* be adopted by editors.[20] But this editorial principle does not rob the scholar of all the leeway he wishes in his treatment of the text where Q and F agree.[21] There may be common error. Such passages should represent a challenge to the textual critic just as much as those passages in Q which are not present in F.

But the attack on Q is a double one. When Shakspere's complete plays came to be printed, Q was used as 'copy' *after* it had been changed by reference to a manuscript with authority. Q can also be shown to be a memorial perversion of the text in this manuscript—as represented by F. My analyses of parallel passages from Q and F will, I hope, convince the interested scholar that Q is a memorial reconstruction. A certain psychological by-play has undoubtedly entered into the past editorial attitude toward Q. Because there is a good text in the light of which the bad text can be interpreted, the bad text has unconsciously assumed a degree of clarity and aptness which it undoubtedly does not possess. If the perception is rid of the presence of F, Q stands forth as a text obviously corrupt. What my examination of Q has taught me is that this text is thoroughly undependable. Its corruption is not merely a matter of mislineation, wrong punctuation, or no punctuation. Any recto or verso of Q will have opacity elbowing ineptness. Q inadvertently omits. Q has a word or line before or after where it belongs. Anticipation or recollection causes assimilation of similar lines in different passages. Q vulgarizes. Q adds unnecessary words. Q substitutes the well-worn phrase for the Shaksperean phrase. Q misunderstands the meaning of lines. Q misunderstands and misinterprets the action. Q spoils fine touches of characterization. Q does not know who the speaker is and guesses. Q runs together two different speakers' lines. Q, in short, stands solidly in the way of Shakspere.

It is reasonable to be concerned about the present text of *King Lear.* It is surely unreasonable to levy charges against the editors who have made it what it is. They have tended to recognize F as the more authoritative text, but taste has been their sole criterion. There are, according to Greg, nearly four hundred Q readings, apart from passages preserved only in Q, in the Globe text.[22] But this numeration does not tell the whole story, for the modern text, depending consciously or unconsciously on Q, interferes—as I shall try to show—with Shakspere's characterization and action. Modern editors follow, for the most part, Clark and Wright's text. One purpose of the present monograph is to indicate that the onus of proof must always rest with the defender of the Q reading. The authority behind Q is a reporter's memory. I hope to show how modern editors have introduced the corruption of Q into the *textus receptus.*

The rest of this study is concerned with analysis of Q as a memorial reconstruction and a consideration of modern editors in the light of this analysis. My basic text has been Vietor's parallel text of F and Q.[23] I have corrected the Q text of this by reference to Greg's list of errors in the Praetorius facsimile[24] which Vietor used and by the collotype facsimile of the Gorhambury copy recently published by the Shakespeare Association.[25] The F text has been checked by reference to the facsimile edited by Dover Wilson.[26] All the passages but three are from places where Q is invariant and where there is a corresponding passage in F. Two passages are given to indicate how Q can be emended where there is no corresponding passage in F. Only one passage invades the territory which Greg has so well covered in *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear',* and this passage is given mainly for purposes of illustration. All the passages I have selected are, I believe, representative of Q as a whole.

After each parallel passage has been analyzed, I try to show what modern editors have done with the passage by citing three representative editions of *King Lear* which cover the past eighty years: *The Globe Edition* of 1865,[27] The *Arden edition* of 1901[28] and the *Kittredge* edition of 1940.[29] All other editorial procedure and comment are de-

rived, under the lines being discussed, from Furness's *Variorum Edition.*[30]

The procedure, therefore, is (A) presentation of texts, (B) comparison of texts, (C) comment upon accepted editorial usage. Act, scene, and line numbering according to nature of the Q leaf at the head of the Q passage. If F the *Globe* is indicated at the head of the F passage, the siglacks the passage, act, scene, and line numbering is given at the head of the Q passage.

A. F (I. i. 151-3)

reserve thy state,
And in thy best consideration checke
This hideous rashness,

Q (B 3 r)

Reverse thy doome, and in thy best consideration
Checke this hideous rashness,

B. F's "reserue thy state", spoken by Kent to Lear, becomes "Reverse thy doome" in Q's 151. This is a memorial anticipation of Q's version, "Revoke thy doom" of F 167's "reuoke thy guift", also spoken by Kent to the King. The reporter's memory was, perhaps, not uninfluenced by recollection of similar conventional phraseology in other Shakespeare plays: 'Reuoke that doom of mercy", *III Henry* VI, II. vi. 46; "reverse the doom of death," *Timon of Athens,* II. iii. 42; "reverse a prince's doom," *Romeo and Juliet,* III. iii. 59. It is significant that Kent in both places in F refers to Lear's abdication, whereas in Q in both places he is made to refer to Cordelia. F's text is infinitely richer and more complex than Q's. How prescient of the events to come are Kent's two short objurgations in F, for the whole tragedy springs from Lear's abdication in Favor of Goneril and Regan! In F, Kent is shown to be concerned not only with Cordelia but with Lear. His regard for his master foreshadows his devotion in the coming scenes. In "reserue thy state" F 151, Kent is concerned with Lear; in F 154-6, with Cordelia; in "reuoke thy gift" F 167, with Lear. In Q, on the other hand, in all three places Kent is concerned only with Cordelia! Furness furnishes us with further evidence against Q's "Reuerse thy doome" in his defence of F's "reserue thy state": "When Lear has been turned out of doors and his daughters have usurped all his powers, Gloucester (III, iv, 156) says, 'Ah that good Kent! He said it would be thus,' which cannot well refer to any other passage than the present." But Q's text is safely indicted on the score of memorial contamination. And we have here a good example of how editorial dependence on Q can vitiate Shakspere.

C. Globe and *Kittredge* follow Q for 151; *Arden* follows F. I add that *Globe* and *Arden* have Q's "Reuoke thy doom" for 167,

while *Kittredge* has F's "reuoke thy guift". Thus *Globe* follows Q for 151 and 167; *Arden* follows F for 151 but Q for 167; *Kittredge* follows Q for 151 but F for 167. Such is the consistency of editors!

A.

F (I. iv. 106-119)

Foole. Let me hire him too, here's my Coxcombe.
Lear. How now my pretty knaue, how dost thou?
Foole. Sirrah, you were best take my Coxcombe.
Lear. Why my Boy?
Foole. Why? for taking ones part that's out of fauor, nay, & thou canst not smile as the wind sits, thou'lt catch colde shortly, there take my Coxcombe; why this fellow ha's banish'd two on's Daughters, and did the third a blessing against his will, if thou follow him, thou must needs weare my Coxcombe. How now Nunckle? would I had two Coxcombes and two Daughters.
Lear. Why my boy?

Q (C4v)

Foole. Let me hire him too, heer's my coxcombe.
Lear. How now my pretty knaue, how do'st thou?
Foole. Sirra, you were best take my coxcombe
Kent. Why Foole?
Foole. Why for taking on's part, that's out of fauour, nay and thou can'st not smile as the wind sits, thou't catch cold shortly, there take my coxcombe; why this fellow hath banisht two on's daughters, and done the third a blessing against his will, if thou follow him, thou must needs weare my coxcombe, how now nuncle, would I had two coxcombes, and two daughters.
Lear. Why my Boy?

B. Q takes 110 from Lear and gives it to Kent in the form, "Why Foole?" The Q line and ascription appear to be a memorial anticipation of II. iv. 68: "*Kent.* Why Foole?" The context in the latter passage and in the present passage are strikingly similar: in the latter, the Fool makes a short anbiguous statement, Kent asks his question, and the Fool's answer makes oblique reflection on Kent's imprudence in following one who is out of favor: "let go thy hold when a great wheele runs downe a hill, least it break thy neck with following". Kent's speech thirty lines later at F I. iv. 141: "This is nothing Foole", may possibly have also been a disturbing factor. Another possible reason for Q's bungling is that Lear has exactly the same speech at 110 and at 119. Editors who are misled by Q and follow it at 110 miss Shakspere's intention: the wily Fool pays no attention to Lear, in spite of the latter's questions, recognizes only Kent, and says to the latter what he wants the King to hear. He *apparently* is talking to Kent but is *really* talking to Lear. Part of the game is for Kent to remain silent. If 110 is given to Kent, this intention is obscured. Note

the minor changes which illustrate the F emender's care: Q substitutes "hath" for "ha's" and "done" for "did" in 114.

C. Globe, Arden, and *Kittredge* follow Q's *"Kent.* Why Foole?" for 110. All three follow F for "did" in 114. *Kittredge* adopts Q's "hath" the other two editions have F's 'has". Editorial inconsistency is revealed by the fact that although F's I. iv. 141: *"Kent.* This is nothing Foole" is given to Lear in Q, none of the three editions follow Q here in its ascription! Malone, Stevens, *Third Variorum,* Collier, and Staunton did, however, and thus obscured one of Shakespeare's subtle touches. I quote White: "It should be observed, that in addressing this poor, faithful follower, the king never calls him Fool. In speaking of him, he gives him his official title, but in speaking *to* him, he always uses some term of familiar and pitiful endearment,—generally 'my boy' . . . ."

St. Louis University.

---

[1]Oxford University Press, 1939, p. ix.

[2]E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems* (Oxford University Press, 1930), I, 466.

[3]In the Introduction to the individual edition of *King Lear* (Boston, 1940), p. viii.

[4]*The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear', A Bibliographical and Critical Inquiry,* Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, No. 15 (Oxford University Press 1940) p. 190.

[5]With one exception. The catchword on K 4 recto was changed to agree with the corrected first word on verso.

[6]Scholars are apt to be bewildered by Greg's assumption that F is authoritative and that Q is corrupt if they have not previously read his article in *Neophilologus,* for which see Footnote 8 below.

[7]*William Shakespeare,* I, 465-6.

[8]"The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism Illustrated in a Study of the Text of 'King Lear,' *"Neophilologus,* XVIII (1933), 253, 256-7; *"King Lear*—Mislineation and Stenography," *Library,* XVII (1936-7), 172-83; *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear',* pp. 138, 187.

[9]*The Text of "King Lear",* Stanford University Publications, University Series, Language and Literature, IV, 2 (1931), 137.

[10]*The Text of Shakespeare's "Lear",* Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama, X (1935), 79.

[11]*William Shakespeare,* I, 465-7.

[12]*Op. cit.,* pp. 253-6.

[13]Oxford University Press, 1923.

[14]*The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear',* p. 138 footnote.

[15]*The Textual History of "Richard III",* Stanford University Publications, University Series, Language and Literature, VI, I, (1936).

[16]P. A. Daniel was the first to point this out in 1885 in his introduction to the Praetorius facsimile of the first quarto (Shakespeare—Quarto Facsimiles, No. 33, pp. xvi-xx). Chambers in 1930 agreed (*William Shakespeare,* I, 165, 465). Greg has revived and added to Daniel's argument in the *Neophilologus* article (pp. 257-61) and in *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'* (pp. 139-49, *passim*). The folio text of *King Lear* does not stand in a class by itself: two other qyuartos were substantially emended by reference to an independent MS. before serving as copy for Jaggard, *Richard III* and *Troilus and Cressida* (Chambers, *William Shakespeare,* I, 165).

[17]"The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism Illustrated in a Study of the Text of *King Lear*", pp. 261-2; *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, p. 187.

[18]The *least* authority we must give him is that he was delegated by Shakspere's company.

[19]This is not to say that he did not make errors. We know that he did (a) when F reproduces an error in an uncorrected sheet of Q which was rectified in the corrected sheet (see Greg, *Variants,* pp. 180-1, and (b) when in passages where Q is invariant, the two texts have common error, as in *"Historica"* (for "Histerica") at II. iv. 57 and Q "him" F "Hym" (for Lym) at III. vi. 72. My impression, for what it is worth, is that the emender was the very opposite of careless. Greg in the pages cited above finds only seven examples of "the folio editor having inadvertently overlooked an error in the uncorrected sheet upon which he was working." Yet of these seven, only *one* is a *sure* example. Six are debatable. One at least can be attributed to a careless F compositor.

[20]Except, of course, where there are strong grounds for believing that the F change represents an error. For example, the emender *may* have misread his MS. (Doran, *"The Text of 'King Lear',"* pp. 91-5, *passim;* but see Greg., "The Function of Bibliography, *etc.*", pp. 260-1); the F compositor may have misread or misunderstood the emender (Daniel *op. cit.,* p. xx concerning I .i. 112); the F compositor may have made a mechanical error and corrected it by guesswork (Greg, "The Function of Bibliography *etc.,*" pp. 260-1 concerning II. ii. 84); the F compositor or emender may have introduced a sophistication (Greg, *Variants,* pp. 155-6 concerning II. i. 102). One can and must make generalizations concerning Q and F, yet one must regard each variant as a problem in itself. Greg's recent book on the variants of Q is a splendid illustration of this attitude.

[21]The editor, however, should take into consideration the imponderable of the emender's scrupulousness in the differing passages.

[22]"The Function of Bibliography, *etc.*", p. 262.

[23]*"King Lear," Parallel Texts of the First Quarto and the First Folio,* Shakespeare Reprints, I, ed. Wilhelm Vietor, Marburg, 1937 (3rd ed.).

[24]*Variants,* pp. 59-6.

[25]*"King Lear"*, 1608 (*Pide Bull Quarto*), Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 1, London, 1939.

[26]London, 1931.

[27]*The Works of William Shakespeare,* The Globe Edition, ed. W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright, Cambridge and London, 1865. This follows the Cambridge Edition, of which Vol. VIII containing *King Lear* was published in 1866.

[28]*The Tragedy of King Lear,* The Arden Edition, ed. W. J. Craig, London, 1915 (2nd ed.).

[29]*The Tragedy of King Lear,* ed. G. L. Kittredge, Boston, 1940.

[30]*King Lear,* A New Variorium Edition, Vol. V, ed. H. H. Furness, Philadelphia, 1880.

A NOTE ON WILSON'S *HAMLET*

By N. B. Allen

WHEN J. Dover Wilson first published *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet and the Problems of its Transmission,* many students of Shakspere scholarship were filled with admiration for the immensity, the careful organization, and the completeness of the work. This admiration, however, did not prevent some of these students from feeling a pang at the way in which Wilson threw into the discard certain readings which had always seemed to them inevitable. The sufferers assumed, of course, that nothing could be done to allay their suffering. Wilson had explained in his preface why his precise methods must supersede the haphazard ways of former editors, who merely chose from the second quarto and from the Folio the readings they happened to prefer. Wilson called their procedure "ladling butter from alternate tubs of unknown manufacture" (p. 9). In order to avoid their errors, Wilson had studied the two texts for years. By a careful examination of the incontrovertible errors to be found in each of them, he had discovered the cause of these errors and had classified them as an aid to ascertaining which of the two texts was to be preferred in cases where the reading of neither was obviously wrong. The care and industry and learning Wilson displayed were overwhelming. If he wanted to change the lines readers had always loved, they would simply have to let him do it. It was enough to make us wish we had lived in the nineteenth century.

A more careful study of certain of Wilson's readings is, however, a source of reviving hope. It is a relief to find that, even though Wilson's work is in many ways sound, we shall not find it necessary to accept all his conclusions.

The failure of Wilson's carefully organized study always to secure good results has two causes. In the first place, many of the links in his chain of reasoning are pure conjecture. He has worked out the history of the manuscripts back of the two texts to his own satisfaction, but the structure of assumption is scaffolded by too few unassailable

facts. As Professor Kittredge puts it, ". . . nothing short of revelation can ever solve such problems beyond dispute."[1] In the second place, even though we accept this part of Wilson's work, even though we may believe he has reconstructed the history of the manuscripts correctly, it does not follow that this enables him to choose the correct readings. It is true that the errors of Q2 are often different in kind from those of F1, but when Q2 and F1 disagree it usually develops that either may be proved wrong by Wilson's methods. The result is that it is just as difficult for Wilson to decide which cause of error operated in the case in question as it was for the old editors to make their "haphazard" choices.

Let us consider, for instance, Wilson's reading for *Hamlet,* I, 5, 32-34:

> "And duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed
> That rots itself in ease on Lethe wharf,
> Wouldst thou not stir in this . . ."

Rots in line 33 is the F1 reading, which Wilson prefers to *roots* of Q2 in spite of the fact that Q2 is here supported by Q1. Before discussing the arguments that Wilson draws from his postulated history of the texts, it will perhaps be well to consider briefly why the Q2 variant has been preferred by most pre-Wilson editors. Though they have not for the most part explained their choice, their reasons must have been something like the following: The Q2 *roots* is consonant with the sense of the preceding lines spoken by Hamlet. Let us consider the two speeches together, this time choosing the Q2 variant:

> *Hamlet:* Haste me to know't, that I, with wings as swift
> As meditation, or the thoughts of love,
> May sweep to my revenge.
> *Ghost:* I find thee apt,
> And duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed
> That roots itself in ease on Lethe wharf,
> Wouldst thou not stir in this . . .

The ghost is carrying out Hamlet's figure. A fat weed *rooted* in the bank[2] is in excellent contrast with an aroused person *sweeping* as if on wings to violent activity. Complete motionlessness is commonly expressed by the phrase "rooted to the spot," and the Ghost shows that he has not

forgotten Hamlet's figure of speech by his final words, "Wouldst thou not *stir* in this." The word *fat,* too, lends support to the quarto reading; for a weed's roots not only make it inactive, but also allow it to feed and grow fat.[3]

To balance this argument, Wilson has only what he calls "a close parallel" from *Antony and Cleopatra,* I, 4, 45-47:

> "Like to a vagabond flag upon the stream,
> Goes to and back, lackeying the varying tide,
> To rot itself with motion."

Thus far, it seems to me, Wilson's reading has come out badly. As yet, however, we have considered only the probable meaning of the passage, and Wilson's work is largely devoted to textual considerations. What light does his hisdecided against the Q2 variant, it will perhaps be well to look first at his opinion about what were the causes of error in Q2. Even though he considers Q2 in general "the text entitled to preference,"[4] Wilson has found so many things wrong with it that it has required a rather elaborate theory to account for them all.

Q2 was, according to Wilson, set up from Shakspere's autograph manuscript, and Shakspere's handwriting was difficult to read, not only because he was careless in forming tory of the texts throw on the problem? Since Wilson has minim-letters and in distinguishing between *r* and *n, d* and *e,* and *o* and *a,*[5] but also because he was, like every "gentleman"[6] of his day, a bad speller.[7] Moreover, the compositor of Q2 was in an unusual hurry, being driven to exceed his proper speed of work in setting up a very difficult manuscript (p. 95). Furthermore, it was particularly difficult for this compositor to hurry, since he was a plodder. He seems to have been so slow, in fact, that Wilson supposes him to have been "a learner or a young journeyman." Finally, there was a press corrector, who, even when he found the word Shakspere intended in type, sometimes changed it because he didn't understand it.[8] In the present case Wilson blames the compositor. This man, says Wilson, found *rots* in Shakspere's manuscript, but could not make it out and turned to Q1 for help. There he found the pirate's *roots.* This explains why Q1 and Q2 agree.[9]

The claim was made above, however, that when Q2 and

F1 disagree it usually develops that either may be proved wrong by Wilson's methods. Here is an opportunity to test that statement. Let us see what line of reasoning Wilson might have followed had he happened to prefer the Q2 reading. In that case, his postulated history of F1 would have furnished him material for argument.

The Folio *Hamlet* is, according to Wilson, one of the most corrupt texts of the whole Shaksperian corpus (p. 43). It abounds in vulgarizations introduced into the text by the maker of the prompt-copy from which it was derived. Wilson calls him Scribe P. This man had considerable dramatic sense, but he was "'conventional, downright, a little crude" (p. 26), and he often changed Shakspere's lines because he failed to understand the idea Shakspere was developing (pp. 48-50 and 68-70). He also had the same difficulty with Shakspere's handwriting that the compositor of Q2 had.

Some of the errors in F1, however, are due, not to Scribe P, but to another scribe, a "slovenly fellow" who made a copy of the prompt book for Hemming and Condell when they started to publish. Wilson calls this second copyist Scribe C. He was outrageously careless, says Wilson, for he knew that his work would never be given the test of theatrical representation, and he thought there was little likelihood of his being brought to account for slovenliness in a text two-thirds of the way through a volume embracing the whole of Shakspere's plays (p. 65).

If he had chosen to discredit the F1 reading, Wilson would have made use of both his postulated scribes. First, however, he would no doubt have returned to Q2 and referred to his theory that it was based on Shakspere's autograph manuscript and should therefore in doubtful cases be preferred to F1. Then he would have pointed out that Q2 is here supported by Q1. At first this fact would seem to have no significance in view of the theory of Wilson mentioned above, that, while setting up Act 1, the compositor of Q2 consulted Q1 when he came to a word that was hard to read. Wilson uses that theory, however, in connection with "bad" Q2 readings. When he comes to a "good" Q2 reading, that is, one that he likes, he argues

that the identity of Q1 gives him support. For, he says in connection with another word, the presence of the reading in Q1 "makes it tolerably certain" that it was spoken on the stage and therefore appeared in the original prompt-book.[10] In other words, Q1 reveals to us that Scribe P agreed with the compositor of Q2 and that it was Scribe C, the slovenly fellow, who made the "error" and brought the "bad" reading into the Folio. To be specific, if Wilson had liked the Q2 *roots,* he might have argued that Shakspere wrote *roots* and that the word successfully got over the hurdles between Shakspere and Q2; that Scribe P retained *roots* in the prompt-book; that the reporter of Q1 therefore heard *roots;* but that, unfortunately for the Folio, Scribe C carelessly made it *rots.*

Wilson might even have explained how Scribe C happened to make the error. Many of this man's changes in the text show him, according to Wilson, to have been well acquainted with *Hamlet,* so well acquainted that we may suppose him to have belonged to the Globe theatre (p. 65). Scribe C reveals this knowledge of *Hamlet* by introducing into the text words from earlier and later parts of the play. Here he wrote *rots* because he had in his mind Marcellus' speech of I, 4, 90

> "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark"

or Hamlet's question to the grave digger (V, 1, 178-9),

> "How long will a man lie i' the earth
> ere he rot?"

This seems far fetched, but I think I am being fair. Consider, for instance, the following examples Wilson gives of mistakes caused by Scribe C's familiarity with the whole play. He argues that Scribe C wrote "drift of conference" (III, 1, 1) as "drift of circumstance" because he remembered "encompasment and drift of question" from Polonius' words to Reynaldo in II, 1, 10, and Hamlet's use of the word "circumstance" in I, 5, 127 (pp. 62-63). Wilson also gives an example of how Scribe C introduced into IV, 4, 3, a word from V, 2, 401 (p. 59). As Wilson says elsewhere, Scribe C is "capable of anything."[11]

Wilson's reading for 1, 2, 129-130 is:

> "O that this too too sullied flesh would melt,
> Thaw and resolve itself into a dew."

Sullied in line 129 is an emendation of the Q2 *sallied*. This emendation Wilson prefers to the more commonly accepted *solid* of F1, his chief argument in favor of the Q2 variant being that it is supported by Q1, which gives us

> "O that this too much griev'd and sallied flesh,
> Would melt to nothing."

"Griev'd and sallied," says Wilson, proves "incontestably" that "the word which the Q1 reporter heard on the stage and carried away in his memory was not *solid* but a past participle" (p. 309). Wilson's changes of heart about the reporter are strange. If he had merely observed that the reporter *might* be right at times, no one would object. But now he considers him more trustworthy that the scribe who, he supposes, wrote out the copy of the Folio *Hamlet* for Hemming and Condell, Scribe C. In fact, after praising the reporter for his "helpful gloss" which shows us that he had "grasped the meaning of the passage," Wilson calls Scribe C a "slovenly fellow who probably lacked here even the excuse of a difficult or illegible word."[12]

If Wilson had not been already too much carried away by his liking for the *sullied* reading[13] to judge this part of the case on its merits, he would have remembered that the reporter of Q1 usually did not have clear impressions of the lines he had heard; that in many places he gives us a jumble of words which miss or even reverse Shakspere's meaning.[14] Such a reporter might give us almost any combination of forms.[15]

The situation was the same as it was in the case of *roots* and *rots,* though Wilson's reaction to it was different. Wilson's study of the texts gave him ammunition to use for or against either variant. He chose to defend Q2 because he felt that *sullied* fitted into the context better than *solid* and then, to justify himself, explained that the support of Q1 was significant, while the variance of F1 was not. It is hardly necessary to add that if Wilson had preferred to defend the F1 reading he could have done so. In fact, he could have brought forth exactly the same argument he used in the *roots-rots* case: Shakspere wrote *solid,* but the compositor of Q2 turned to Q1 for aid in making out a carelessly written word and was led astray by the Q1 error.[16]

Wilson's real reasons for choosing the Q2 variant, then, rest on æsthetic and dramatic considerations, just as did those of the older editors. He likes *sullied* because he mother's incest. He feels that the word in conjunction with "melt-thaw-dew" shows that "Hamlet is thinking of snow begrimed with soot and dirt as it often is in melting, and wishing that his 'sullied flesh' might melt as snow melts in time of thaw." The weakness of this argument lies in the fact that elsewhere in this soliloquy Hamlet says nothing believes that it is consistent with Hamlet's horror at his about his feeling that his mother's incest has sullied *him.* And *solid* has a real connection with what follows. Two things keep Hamlet from eluding his woes: his flesh, which is too solid to melt away, and God's law against suicide.[17]

Other of Wilson's changes from the traditional readings follow.

I, 3, 64-65

"But do not dull thy palm with entertainment
Of each new-hatch'd, unfledg'd *courage* . . ."

Wilson here prefers the Q2 *courage* to the F1 *comrade* because *courage* also appears in Q1 (2:295). "The agreement between Q2 and Q1," he says, "makes it tolerably certain that *courage* appeared in the prompt-book and that *comrade,* like so many of the easier readings of F1, was nothing but a paraphrase or makeshift of Scribe C." As in the other cases, Wilson's theories about the history of the texts might have served just as well to prove the opposite. If Wilson had liked the F1 *comrade* (as have most editors), he could have used the *rots* argument against *courage* instead of using the *sullied* argument in favor of it.[18] Certainly the insertion of *courage* in the place of *comrade* is in keeping with the habits of the makers of Q1.[19]

II, 2, 137

"Or given my heart a *working,* mute and dumb"

Wilson prefers the Q2 *working* to the F1 *winking* and declares, ". . . There can be no doubt at all, despite the editors, that *working* was the word Shakespeare intended."[20] He blames the "change" on Scribe P, the maker of the prompt copy, but his argument is based, as Parrott and

Craig show, on a misunderstanding of the word *winking.*[21] If Wilson had felt as Parrott and Craig do about it, he might have discredited Q2 either through the compositor or through the press corrector. In this case there is no Q1 reading to aid or hinder.

II, 2, 506

> "But who, *ah woe,* had seen the mobled Queen —"

This Q2 variant Wilson prefers to the F1 (and Q1) *O who.* He ascribes the F1 reading to a change made by Scribe P as in the case just preceding (1:73). But if Wilson had preferred the F1 and Q1 reading, he might very well have laid the Q2 variant to a combination of mistakes by the compositor and the press corrector of Q2. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Wilson's arguments would have been as follows:

The compositor omitted the *h* from *o who,*[22] making it *o wo,* and the press corrector, who never consulted the manuscript, amended it to *a woe,* normalizing the spelling of *wo* and changing the *o* to *a* to avoid unpleasant repetition.

II, 2, 614-616

> "Must like a whore unpack my heart with words,
> And fall a-cursing like a very drab,
> A *stallyon.*"

Wilson prefers the Q2 *stallyon* to the F1 *scullion,* though Q1 has *scalion* and Wilson shows that he accepts this as a misprint for *scullion.* He assumes again that Scribe P made the change to *scullion* and that the reporter of Q1 therefore heard *scullion* on the stage.[23] He could, of course, have discredited *stallyon* just as well—by charging it to the compositor of Q2, to the press corrector of Q2, or to a combination of the two. If he had chosen to do the last, he might have assumed that the compositor set *scullion* up as *stullion* (Wilson explains that he often confused Shakspere's *c's* and *t's* (1:111), and that the corrector miscorrected it to *stallyon.*[24] Wilson insists on *stallyon* because he thinks its meaning, "a male whore," fits in exactly with *whore* and *drab.* There is no indication, however, that stallions in Wilson's sense of the word had a reputation for cursing. Scullions, on the other hand, did so. In this connection Kittredge

cites *Henry IV,* pt. 2, II, 1, 65—the Page's abuse of the name-calling hostess:

> "Away, you scullion! you rampallian! you fustilarian!" (p. 24).

IV, 2, 18

> "He keeps them like an *apple* in the corner of his jaw,
> first mouth'd to be last swallowed."

Wilson insists on *apple,* the Q2 variant, instead of *ape* of F1 and Q1. As in the case of the three variants just discussed, Wilson blames Scribe P for the "change" (1:72). The press corrector of Q2 might just as well have been at fault. Wilson elsewhere pictures him as having made many "miscorrections due to misunderstanding" (I: 146-50). It is clear that their creator gave Scribe P and the press corrector of Q2 a great deal in common. In defense of the *apple* variant Wilson quotes a phrase from *Henry VIII* (V, iv, 63-64), which indicates that theatergoers liked apples. Kittredge, however, points out that the peculiar style of eating suggests an ape (*op. cit.,* p. 250).

V, 1, 260

> "To sing *sage* Requiem, and such rest to her."

Here Wilson prefers *sage* Requiem of F1 to *a* Requiem of Q2, blaming the Q2 "error" on the press corrector. On the other hand, to discredit F1 Scribe C has only to be blamed for one more error. Wilson is almost unique among editors in choosing this reading.

But why, one is moved to ask, why has Wilson so often turned against the generally accepted readings? The situation being what it was, why couldn't he have saved us suffering by defending the readings we were all used to? The answer is that Wilson's point of view was different from that of the old editors. They were merely bringing out editions of *Hamlet.* Wilson was actuated by the spirit of research, and he was influenced by all that implies in the twentieth century. An editor is traditionally conservative. A researcher usually sets out to destroy tradition. The procedure is not necessarily a conscious one. The researcher hopes that he will make discoveries, and when he sees the possibility of doing so it is difficult for him not to rationalize a proof. It is a subtle infection of insidious growth.

Since, in most cases of disagreement between the texts, Wilson had abundant material at hand for proving *any* reading wrong, it was only human for him to justify his years of work by proving that, up to now, our editions of *Hamlet* had contained many errors.

To put the whole thing briefly, Wilson has not superseded the work of earlier editors, as he seems to think he has. He is "ladling butter from alternate tubs" as well as they, and, though he *may* know considerably more about the tubs than did his predecessors, this knowledge in most cases has told him nothing about which tub to ladle from.[25] Moreover, his desire to amaze the world with a new concoction has often led him to the wrong one.

The statement in the last paragraph—that Wilson may know considerably more about the history of the texts than did his predecessors—is not intended to indicate that all his elaborate conjectures about the history of these texts are acceptable. Scribe P's place in the story is particularly hard to believe in. The changes Wilson supposes him to have made in *Hamlet* indicate that, after he turned the manuscript over to the theater, Shakspere's control over it ceased; in fact, that Shakspere was not available for consultation about the meaning of difficult passages (1:172-73). This theory of Wilson is almost enough to make us fear that he is a Baconian fifth columnist.

University of Delaware.

---

[1]*The Tragedy of Hamlet,* New York, 1939, p. viii.

However, one cannot help admiring Wilson for his extraordinary willingness to make conjectures. At one point (*op. cit.,* p. 164) he undertakes to guess what changes the Q2 compositor would have made if he had set up an omitted passage.

[2]*Wharf* here means *bank.*

[3]Shakspere often connects the ideas of eating and dishonorable inactivity. Examples are:

1. *Hamlet,* IV, 4, 33-35:
   "What is a man,
   If his chief good and market of his time
   Be but to sleep and feed?"
2. *Antony and Cleopatra,* II, 1, 26-27:
   "That sleep and feeding may prorogue his honor
   Even till a Lethe'd dullness."
3. *Antony and Cleopatra,* II, 6, 65-66:
   ". . . I have heard that Julius Cæsar
   Grew fat with feasting there."

[4]*Op. cit.*, Vol. 11, pp. 177-179.

[5]*Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 106-112.

[6]See below, the last paragraph of this article.

[7]Vol. I, p. 99 and pp. 114-119. In arriving at his conclusions about Shakspere's handwriting and spelling, Wilson makes use of the assumption that three autograph pages in *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* were written by Shakspere.

[8]Vol. I, pp. 121-151. One of the peculiarities of this press corrector was that he never consulted the original manuscript.

[9]Vol. I, p. 161. Wilson believes that the compositor of Q2 made use of Q1 only while he was setting up the first act.

[10]Wilson uses this argument to support the Q2 reading *courage* of I, 3, 65 (Vol. II, p. 295). See also my discussion of this Wilson reading below, p. 160. It is significant that *courage* is also in Act. I.

[11]Vol. II, p. 316. Nor would Wilson have had any difficulty in justifying either reading textually had Q1 agreed with F1, instead of with Q2. In that case he could have supported the Q2 *roots* by blaming the F1 reading on Scribe P. If Scribe P put *rots* into the prompt-book, the reporter of Q1 would naturally have heard it on the stage; so the identity of Q1 and F1 would prove nothing. (Wilson—p. 311—uses this argument in support of the amended Q2 reading *sullied* of I, 2, 129.) The support of Q1 would not have helped Wilson to defend the F1 *rots*, but there he would need no help. We have seen how he gets along without that support.

[12]Wilson's abuse of Scribe C is so unremitting that one feels at times like defending the poor creature—until one remembers that, after all, Wilson has the right, having created Scribe C, to treat him as he pleases.

[13]This reading was first suggested by the novelist George Macdonald in 1885. Wilson says (Vol. II, p. 307) that a like suggestion was put forward by Dowden in the Arden edition, but, though Dowden mentions the possibility of the *sullied* reading in his notes, he prefers *solid*.

[14]As Parrott and Craig observe in their edition of the second quarto (Princeton University Press, 1938, pp. 37-38) the Q1 version of the "To be or not to be" soliloquy makes Hamlet console himself for the ills of this life by thinking of the Everlasting Judge who will reward him for his good deeds at death. Another example of the Q1 reporter's incompetence is the passage about the fat weed on Lethe wharf which has been discussed above. By omitting the last part of the sentence, "Wouldst thou not stir in this," the reporter makes the Ghost advise Hamlet to be dull.

[15]Even were the reporter of Q1 a man to be trusted, we could not be sure that *griev'd* proves *sullied* to be a past participle. It is not unusual to find a past participle coupled with another adjective not a past participle. Note, for instance, *Hamlet*, III, 3, 94-95:

> "And that his soul may be as *damn'd and black*
> As hell, whereto it goes."

Also *Hamlet*, II, 2, 531:

> "About her *lank and all o'er-teemed loins*."

Sullied may have been a phonetic spelling to represent Burbadge's pronunciation of *solid*. There are many examples of phonetic spellings in Q1. Examples:

1. pollax (Polacks, I, 1, 63)
2. ceasen (season, I, 3, 93)
3. bace (base, I, 4, 71)
4. wherling (whirling, I, 5, 133)
5. sellerige (cellarage, 1, 5, 151)
6. trapically (tropically, III, 2, 47)
7. dan'd (donned, IV, 5, 52)

Trapically and *dan'd* are especially significant, for they are indications of the fact that the confusion of *o* and *a* was common in Shakspere's time. In his edition of *Hamlet* (p. 146) Kittredge gives the following examples of spellings which indicate this: *farren* for *foreign; clatpole* for *clotpole; quandam* for *quondam*.

On the other hand, the word *sullied* may merely have been one of the many outrageous errors in words of Q1. Some of them are amazingly wide of the mark. Examples:

1. invelmorable (invulnerable, I, 1, 45)
2. impudent, (impotent, I, 2, 29)
3. generall (generous, I, 3, 74)
4. dreams (drains, I, 4, 10)
5. ceremonies (cerements, I, 4, 48)
6. beckles (beetles, I, 4, 70)
7. Artiue (artery, I, 4, 83)
8. arganian (Hyrcanian, 11, 2, 272)
9. calagulate (coagulate II, 2, 484)
10. Epiteeth (epitaph, II, 2, 551)
11. abominable (abominably, III, 2, 40)
12. laught (length, V, 2, 276)
13. vessels (eisel, V, 1, 299)

[16]Wilson does, in fact, make this supposition to explain the *a* in *sallied* (Vol. II, p. 310). That is, he blames the Q1 reporter for the incorrect spelling of the word at the same time that he praises him for making its meaning "incontestably clear."

[17]Kittredge (*Op. cit.*, p. 146) points out a significant parallel from *Henry IV, pt. 2*, III, 1, 47-49:

> "And the continent,
> Weary of solid firmness melt itself
> into the sea."

Wilson also argues that Shakspere could not have made Hamlet speak of his solid flesh, for Burbadge, who played the part, was getting fat in 1601, and such an epithet would have "convulsed the playhouse with laughter and ruined the play." In order to make the situation more ridiculous and impossible, Wilson pictures Burbadge as striking himself despairingly on the breast before reciting the soliloquy. By this Wilson merely proves that a fat man could burlesque the line if he liked. He does not prove that the line is ridiculous in itself, and it is obvious that no good actor, whether fat or thin, would have difficulty in making it effective. As Parrott and Craig remind us (*op. cit.*, p. 77) "too too solid" has been in practically all acting versions of *Hamlet* since 1623, and we have no record of its having ruined the play.

[18]See above, p. 160. See also Kittredge's arguments that *courage* is out of place here, both because of its meaning and because of its accent (*op. cit.*, p. 156).

[19]See above, note 15.

[20]1: 74-75. Wilson declares that all editors before him have used the F1 variant, and Parrott and Craig and Kittredge, who have edited *Hamlet* since Wilson wrote, have also preferred F1 here.

[21]*Op. cit.*, p. 117: "Wilson explains the Q2 text as meaning 'the secret thoughts of the heart' and insists that *winking* taken with *mute* and *dumb* is a 'case of sheer misunderstanding.' But *winking* in this passage does not mean 'sleeping' as Wilson interprets it, but rather 'closing the eyes to,' 'conniving at.' Cf. *Oth.* IV, 2, 77, *Cym.*, V, 4, 194, and *K. H. V*, II, 2, 55 . . ."

[22]According to Wilson omitting letters was one of the Q2 compositor's faults. See his list, Vol. 1, p. 118.

[23]1: 71 and 2: 312.

[24]Wilson makes comparable conjectures in connection with other readings. See Vol. I, pp. 144-146.

[25]Wilson admits that he has been at times confronted with situations where, because of the great number and variety of the causes of corruption to the texts, it has been "impossible to feel certain which of the two readings offered best represents Shakespeare's intention" (Vol. II, p. 176). In the cases cited above, however, Wilson claims textual backing for his choice of variants.

"MAKING THE GREEN ONE RED"

By RUSSELL K. ALSPACH

ARTHUR MURPHY is generally credited with being the first to suggest the correct reading of "Making the green one red" (*Macbeth,* II, 2, 64), in the *Gray's Inn Journal* for 27th January, 1752.[1] In his *Life of Garrick,* Murphy himself claims he was the first to read the line correctly, and further that he brought Garrick around to his point of view: "It is true that he [Garrick] was for some time in the habit of saying, the *green-one* red; but upon consideration he adopted the alteration which was first proposed by this writer in *The Gray's Inn Journal.*"[2]

Without invalidating Murphy's claim, it should be noted that Thomas Sheridan in his *A Course of Lectures on Elocution* (1762) made the same point: "There is a passage which, as it has been generally spoken on the stage, and read by most people, is downright nonsense; which yet in itself is a very fine one, and conveys an idea truly sublime. I mean an expression of Macbeth's after he has committed the murder, where he says,

> Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
> Clean from my hands? No—these my hands will rather,
> The multitudinous sea incarnardine [*sic*],
> Making the green one, red.

"Now the last line pronounced in that manner, calling the sea, the green one, makes flat nonsense of it. But if we read it with proper emphasis and stop, and say, making the green—one red. Here is a most sublime idea conveyed, that his hands, dipped into the sea, would change the colour of the whole ocean from green to red; making the green—one red."[3]

No indication is here that Sheridan knew anything of Murphy's criticism; the two men, so far as mention of one another appears in their work, were apparently not acquainted.[4] And in his long career of acting, Sheridan had ample opportunity to arrive at his conclusion independently of, and perhaps before, Murphy.

Sheridan's career began in Dublin at the Theatre Royal

in Smock Alley, in January, 1743, where he was a success in *Richard III.* In the spring of 1744 he was engaged for Covent Garden, where on March 31 he played *Hamlet;* April 3, *Hamlet;* April 5, *Hamlet;* April 13, *Macbeth;* and April 18, *Julius Caesar.*[5] Garrick employed him for the season of 1744-5 at Drury Lane; the following season he returned to Dublin as manager of the Theatre Royal, where he remained until 1754. Because of some trouble in Dublin he came back to London for two years; in 1756 he was again in Dublin. Soon thereafter he began his lectures on elocution, a subject in which he was deeply interested all his life.[6]

It is important to note that Sheridan was not in London in 1752 when No. 15 of the *Gray's Inn Journal,* which contained Murphy's criticism, was published; and further, that Sheridan acted in *Macbeth* at Covent Garden on April 13, 1744, only a little more than three months after Garrick played *Macbeth* at Drury Lane on January 7, 1744, *"as written by Shakespeare."*[7]

What version of *Macbeth* Sheridan used at Covent Garden in 1744 we do not know. Presumably it was Davenant's; if so, he would notice that Davenant had foreseen the difficulty of the "green one red," for his version reads:

> can the Sea afford
> Water enough to wash away the stain?
> No, they would sooner add a tincture to
> The Sea, and turn the green into a red.[8]

And if Sheridan followed Garrick's example at Drury Lane and produced *Macbeth* "as written by Shakespeare," I believe we can assume that Sheridan put into practice what he afterward preached in his *Lectures on Elocution* about the "green one red." Archer and Lowe, in " 'Macbeth' on the Stage," say that "In the Dagger Scene he [Sheridan] almost equalled Garrick. That he would speak the lines accurately there can be no doubt, for he was above all an elocutionist."[9] And the testimony of Thomas Davies that "some critics did not scruple to . . . prefer Sheridan's performance . . . [in] Macbeth . . . to the other's [Garrick's] utmost efforts in . . . [this] . . . part"[10] should be taken into account. That Sheridan himself placed im-

portance on his interpretation of the line is shown by his quoting in his *Lectures on the Art of Reading* (1775)[11] the entire passage I have given above from *A Course of Lectures on Elocution.* He would hardly have done so had he not thought he was the first to read the line correctly.

Therefore the supposition is easy to make that when Sheridan went to Drury Lane in the fall of 1744 to act for Garrick it was his criticism rather than Murphy's that led Garrick to change his interpretation. But of this there can obviously be no first-hand proof. We might remember, however, that eight years elapsed between Garrick's 'Macbeth' in 1744 and Murphy's *Gray's Inn Journal* in 1752; and over fifty years between Garrick's 'Macbeth' and Murphy's *Life of Garrick* in 1801. Time has a way of confusing memory.

University of Pennsylvania.

---

[1]*Macbeth,* Variorum edition, Phila., 1903, p. 141.
[2]London, 1801, p. 82.
[3]Providence, 1796, p. 84.
[4]Murphy mentions Sheridan quite casually in his *Life of Garrick,* pp. 360-365, as been employed by Garrick for the season of 1761-2 and as being especially good in *King John.*
[5]John Genest, *Some Account of English Stage, Bath,* 1832, IV, 74-75.
[6]DNB.
[7]Genest, *op. cit.,* IV, 62.
[8]*Macbeth,* altered by Sir William Davenant, London, 1674, II, 1. J. D. E. Williams, in *Sir William Davenant's Relation to Shakespeare* (Liverpool, 1905), has pointed out (p. 84) that Davenant consistently cleared up for the audience what he thought was obscure in Shakespeare. Williams does not, however, go into the question of how much the later editors of Shakespeare have relied on this "clearing up" by Davenant. The later editors have, of course, been mostly occupied with Davenant's mutilations of Shakespeare.
[9]*English Illustrated Magazine,* Dec., 1888.
[10]*Memoirs of Garrick,* London, 1784, I, 300.
[11]Third edition, London, 1787, p. 114.

HAMLET AND THE GONZAGO MURDERS

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

IN what may be called the recent past some professed Shakspere scholars have found difficulties in the interpretation, significance and technique of one of the most important elements in *Hamlet:* the mouse-trap. The giants in Shaksperian scholarship of past generations, Dr. Johnson, Capell, Malone, Steevens, Verplanck, White, Furnivall, Dyce, Knight, Hudson, Furness, Rolfe, and others, were not in the slightest degree disturbed by this famous scene. It is only modern scholarship, looking for novelty, which finds it necessary to ask the following questions: Why did Hamlet permit the dumbshow to be presented (at the beginning of the performance), thus risking the success of his plan to catch the conscience of the king? Did it not occur to Hamlet that his uncle-father, seeing his crime enacted "in every detail" (!) in the dumbshow, might order the play (*The Murder of Gonzago*) to be stopped? Why *did* not Claudius stop the play? Why did Hamlet set his trap doubly, first with a dumbshow and then with dialogue which repeats the matter of the dumbshow? Why did Shakspere introduce a dumbshow so utterly unlike dumbshows in other plays of the period? Why, after seeing the dumbshow, does Claudius ask "Is there no offence in't?"

In their attempts to answer these questions, the inquirers have ignored the text of the play, have left common sense and known dramatic technique out of consideration and resorted to fantastic speculations, guesses and distortions. One theory, which deserves to be characterized as 'silly,' avows that the Ghost's revelations to Hamlet were false, and that consequently Claudius did not see his crime enacted and had no reason for being disturbed by the dumbshow. Other theories, not so wild as this, though no less absurd, aver that the King did not see or notice the dumbshow because (being an ill-mannered country bumpkin?) he was engaged in conversation with his queen and Polonius, or because—as a result of carelessness on Hamlet's part?—the royal couple were sitting in a location from which the dumbshow was invisible, or because—as in a recent production of the play in New York—the King was busy eating French

pastry (no doubt from the nearest Danish pastry shop), or because (as was suggested at a meeting of the Modern Language Association) the King was drunk. There being not the slightest particle of justification in the text for any of these perversions of Shakspere's obvious intentions, another distinguished scholar, addicted to a different variety of surmises, opined that the dumbshow was not Shakspere's work and had been foisted into the play by a stupid interpolator. Reference to the dialogue between Hamlet and Ophelia is sufficient to disprove the theory.

Upon the arrival of the players in Elsinore, Hamlet was reminded of a play entitled *The Murder of Gonzago,* which, as luck would have it, the troupe had in its bag of tricks. That Hamlet knew of it and that the wandering troupe had a copy of it with them signify (to us as the audience witnessing a performance of *Hamlet*) that the play had recently proved a successful entertainment "in the city" and that country folk would be interested in seeing (and hearing) the matter.

Why did Hamlet, or, rather, Shakspere, choose *The Murder of Gonzago* for performance before the assembled Danish court? Obviously because, as Hamlet informs Horatio, it dealt with certain incidents which paralleled Claudius's crime. ("One scene of it comes near the circumstance Which I have told thee of my father's death.")

It may perhaps be asked how did Shakspere-Hamlet know of a play dealing with the consequences of the murder of a king or duke (in Shaksperian fiction the two are not distinguished) by poisoning through the ear while indulging in an after-dinner nap in his orchard. (That, of course, is the incident upon which Shakspere has focused our attention; it is that that is to catch the conscience of the King.) The answer is to be found in a now almost wholly ignored chapter of Italian domestic history. On May 7, 1592 (!), the Marchese Alfonso Gonzaga di Castelgoffredo was murdered by his nephew, the Marchese Rudolfo di Castiglione, who, desiring to get possession of his uncle's estate, sent eight cutthroats to slay him as he was resting at midday. Seven months later the treacherous and lecherous nephew, a pious man (so it is said), was himself shot as he was com-

ing out of church and torn to pieces by a mob of outraged women. It can hardly be doubted that this sensational affair, so typically Italian from the point of view of Elizabethan Englishmen, was a subject for gossip in European circles and served to bring back to memory another and more sensational affair in the Gonzaga family which involved the murder, in October 1537, of Francesco Maria I della sick for some time. Rumor, based on good evidence, asserted that he was murdered by poisoning through the ear. It is noteworthy that, like Hamlet's father, he was buried in full armor. For the historical details of this notorious scandal the reader is referred to an essay by Mr. G. Boughner in the *Modern Language Review* (October 1935, 30: 433-44).*

There can be no doubt that Shakspere was well acquainted with these matters. The story, says Hamlet, was Rovere, Duke of Urbino, a man of learning, valor, and exceptional character, who (as the historians relate) had been "extant and writ in choice Italian." If the "story" was a play, now lost, it may very well have been a fusion of these two murders in the Gonzaga family, a technique similar to Shakspere's fusion of two murders (Duncan and Duff in *Macbeth*.) Shakspere had good reason to take it for granted that not a few in his audience would recall these infamous intrigues.

It must be remembered that up to the presentation of the play, Claudius had no idea that Hamlet suspected him of having murdered his father and seduced his mother. When Rosencrantz and Guildenstern reported that the Prince was delighted with the arrival of the players and had arranged for the performance of a play, the King was much contented to hear him so inclined. It did not even occur to him to ask what the play would be. He might have done so if Polonius had not been so enthusiastic about the matter (III, i, 21-23). If Polonius approved of it, it was beyond a doubt unobjectionable.

Night comes and the invited guests enter the theatre, the great hall in the castle. The King and the Queen take their places, undoubtedly the best seats in the hall, from which

they would have a perfect view of all that passed on the improvised stage before them. As soon as the guests have been seated and conversation has ceased, the dumb-show is enacted. An elderly man, clearly an Italian, wearing a crown (which, of course, King Hamlet had too much sense to do) and seemingly quite sick (which Gertrude's first husband was not) enters with his Queen, very lovingly, and lies down on a bank of flowers. He falls asleep; his affectionate wife leaves him. A "fellow," in Italian costume, enters, approaches the sleeping figure, takes off the crown and kisses it. Thus far all is well; nothing that has happened suggests to Claudius any connection with his crime. Surely Gertrude did not "always of the afternoon" accompany her spouse to his garden couch. Claudius had not removed the crown from his sleeping brother's head—there was no crown to remove—and had not kissed it. When the "fellow" pours poison in the sleeper's ears, Claudius (we may assume) starts; but he is no fool; he instantly realizes that he must not display emotion, that he must steel himself for what may follow. After all, this is only a play, and plays are written about crimes and criminals. It is unfortunate that this play should deal with a crime so similar to his. He should have inquired what the play was about. To stop the performance at this point would be madness. The dumbshow continues. After the dead body has been "carried away," the poisoner wooes the Queen "with gifts: she seems loath and unwilling awhile, but in the end accepts his love." Claudius breathes a sigh of relief. He did not have to *woo* Gertrude *after* her husband's demise; she had been his mistress *before* her husband's untimely taking-off. And it may be doubted that Claudius wooed Gertrude "with gifts"; a queen is not wooed with "rings and things and fine array." (True, Ghost Hamlet laments that his brother's "wicked gifts" had seduced his "seeming-virtuous queen," but the "traitorous gifts" he had in mind are the "witchcraft of his wit," his cleverness, his amiable personality.)

The dumbshow, which the audience may regard as a dramatist's way of suggesting what is to come or of disclosing a past incident which it is important for the spectators to know if the story of the succeeding play is to be understood, is over. The spectators have a few moments for gen-

eral chatter or for comments on what they had seen. The King, no doubt, has determined not to betray himself, come what come may.

The Player King and Queen enter and indulge in loving dialogue which bears no relation to the Hamlet-Claudius-Gertrude history. The description of the King in the *Gonzago* play (III, ii, 173-174) does not fit the departed Hamlet; and Gertrude, a woman incapable of deep love, did not indulge in such exaggerated expressions of conjugal devotion. "In second husband let me be accurst," protests the Player Queen. Many women have said such things to their husbands. It was in bad taste, to be sure, to make references to second husbands in Gertrude's presence. When the Player Queen generalizes that "None wed the second but who killed the first," she is giving expression to such an absurd sentiment that Hamlet's audience may manifest its disgust, and some may wonder how such a stupid piece of work could have been chosen by Hamlet; but what can you expect from a madman? The play is "wormwood" to more than to the Queen, we may be sure. It is fortunate for Hamlet's plan that the Player Queen says what is manifestly untrue. Had she said, "None wed again, but who betray'd the first," Claudius would have been justified in ending the play then and there.

The speeches which follow between the Player King and Queen, continuing to harp on the theme of second marriage, besides indulging in psychological platitudes, for the time being relieves the King of any anxiety about himself. When Hamlet's remark about the Player Queen keeping her word (line 241) shows that he is familiar with the play, Claudius boldly asks "Is there no offence in't?" He does this to give those sitting about him the impression that he is concerned for his Queen's feelings, lest the players might say something offensive about second marriages. Hamlet, pretending to misunderstand the King's meaning, assures his uncle that *"they* [the actors] do but jest, poison in jest." Claudius infers that the play may prove to be a comedy, and pleasantly asks "What do you call the play?" Hamlet, now playing the rôle of chorus, then informs him (and the others sitting and standing near) that this is the play about

the notorious Gonzago murder. The King is greatly relieved to learn this; he had heard something about that affair; the business about poison in the ears had no reference to himself, thank God. This is confirmed, he thinks, by Hamlet's remark, "Let the *galled* jade wince, *our* [your and my] withers are unwrung."

The play continues. Lucianus enters and Hamlet explains he is "nephew to the King." Claudius happily notes that Hamlet had not said "Brother to the King." Hamlet engages in baudy pleasantries with Ophelia, and seems at first not to be affected by the proceedings on the stage. However, the "damnable faces" of Lucianus, suggesting guilt, fear of discovery, horror of the crime, are too much for Claudius and he blenches, grows pale. Thereupon Hamlet, suddenly frenzied by the spectacle which re-enacts the slaying of his father, jumps up, confronts his uncle, and excitedly proclaims, "He poisons him in the garden . . . for's estate. His name's . . . *Gonzago* [no, not Claudius]! The story is extant, and writ in choice . . . Italian [not Danish]. You** shall see anon how the murderer gets the love of Gonzago's wife!" Hamlet's excitement and what sounds like a threat to divulge the adulterous relationship between Claudius and Gertrude, besides what he may know or suspect about the poisoning, is too much for Claudius—and he breaks up the performance. To the assembled court it seems that the King's action is prompted solely by Hamlet's mad behavior and by the tasteless play he had selected for performance. Hamlet is convinced he has caught the conscience of the King; but more than that, *The Murder of Gonzago* has enabled him to play with his crafty uncle as a cat does with a mouse. That is why we have a dumbshow which is so like and so unlike Claudius's crime. And Shakspere has succeeded in entertaining his audience with an intensely dramatic and stirring scene—one of the most nearly perfect scenes in the whole range of English literature.

*For a vivid account of the 1592 murder and of the character of the nephew (so like Claudius) the reader is referred to *Allgemeine Encyclopädie* (1862), 74: 189,—an article which was translated for me by my friend Dr. Ralph Rosenberg.

**This "You" may be addressed to the audience on the stage rather than to Claudius alone.

THE RELATION BETWEEN *THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR* AND JONSON'S *EVERY MAN IN HIS HUMOUR*

By SALLIE SEWELL

FEW of Shakspere's plays have occasioned more "throwing about of brains," more weeping and wailing, and gnashing of scholarly teeth, than *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (*MW*). Many reasons have been adduced for the inferior quality of the comedy, as well as for the degradation of Falstaff; too many, in fact, for them to be listed here, and certainly too many for another to be suggested. The present study is therefore not intended as an apology or explanation for *MW,* but simply as another attempt to hold the eel of influence by the tail. In other words, the following investigation is intended to present the apparent relation between *MW* and Jonson's *Every Man In His Humour* (*EMIH*).

To begin with, it is necessary to consider the question of date. As for *EMIH,* Jonson himself tells us in the 1616 folio edition that the play was "first acted in the yeere 1598," a statement which is corroborated by the appearance of the quarto in 1602, by a letter in State Papers mentioning the performance, and by the failure of Meres to mention Jonson as a writer of comedies before 1598. The date of *MW,* though far more difficult to determine, is derived from its obvious relation to the two parts of *Henry IV,* the production of which is almost certainly 1597-98. If, as most scholars believe, and as Kittredge tersely puts it, "there can be no question that the *Merry Wives* is later than *Henry IV,*"[2] it must accordingly be dated between the latter part of 1598 and the appearance of the quarto in 1601-2. With Charles R. Baskervill, Maurice Castelain, C. H. Herford, and Percy Simpson, let us accept 1598 as the date of *EMIH;* and, with H. C. Hart, G. L. Kittredge, and E. K. Chambers, 1598-1602 as the date of *MW.*[3]

For the purposes of the present study, in other words, *EMIH* is viewed as having preceded *MW* by a period of a few months to three years. The further question of Shak-

spere's having had access to the Jonson play before its publication in 1602 presents no difficulties. Though we know nothing of the manuscript, we do know from the list of characters in the Jonson folio that Shakspere acted in the original production, creating the rôle of the elder Lorenzo (Knowell).[4] At rehearsals and at performances, when the play was "sundry times publickly acted," he had the chance to observe not only particular lines and scenes, but more fundamentally, matters of technique and their effect on the audience. Given such an opportunity, it is hard to believe that even if he never made conscious use of the material, he would not in some way have been influenced by Jonson's methods.

Turning now to the three fundamental resemblances between the two plays—those of character, plot, and the choice of identical current foibles for ridicule,—we consider first the question of character, limiting the discussion to the three pairs in which the kinship is most striking: to Stephen and Slender, Bobadil and Falstaff, Kitely and Ford. The similarities between Stephen and Slender, some of which are typed characteristics of the gull but some of which are individual, may be briefly summarized. Both are stupid creatures, dependent for their ideas, their social standing, their actions, and their very words upon their respective uncles and cousins. Slender is constantly reminding us that he keeps a servant, "my man Simple," and that he lives "like a poor gentleman born," and Stephen's claim to gentlemanly propensities runs like a refrain throughout the play. Stephen intends to take up hawking, dueling, tobacco smoking, and cursing simply because these are established earmarks of the class; he introduces himself to Prospero as "somewhat melancholie, but you shall command me in whatsoever is incident to a Gentleman."

Both use effeminate expressions or oaths to cover their constant embarrassment, Slender's favorites being "Ay" and "Forsooth," Stephen's, "By my fackins" and "Forsooth." Both write verses to their ladies and are dependent upon books of instruction to guide their activities, particularly their amorous ones; just as Stephen can't go hawking without a book, Slender can master no conversation without his collection of sonnets or riddles. Both attempt to cover their

physical cowardice by swaggering and boasting, Slender asserting that he is not afraid of bears, not even a little bit; Stephen proclaiming what he would do to the insolent servant, "*if* he could catch him."

With regard to treatment, Shakspere's Slender, as we might expect, is the more sympathetically handled. His helplessness, portrayed by a capable actor, has something of the appealing quality of a Charlie Chaplin characterization or of the half-witted Dannie in the recent novelette, *Of Mice and Men*. "For though I cannot remember what I did when you made me drunk," Slender says wistfully, "yet I am not *altogether* an ass." Then he adds, "I'll ne'er be drunk whilst I live again but in honest, civil, godly company, for this trick. If I be drunk, I'll be drunk with those that have the fear of God, and not with drunken knaves." Although Stephen's stupidity, enhanced by affectation, is more clearly in the line of the "true ridiculous," the changes and additions of Jonson's revision tend, as I have shown elsewhere,[5] to render him more sympathetic in the manner of Shakspere.

The similarity between Bobadil and Falstaff is peculiarly interesting because of the reputation each character bears to the canon of his respective author, Bobadil being ranked as Jonson's supreme creation, and Falstaff, regarded as a sort of bastard, not to be mentioned in the same breath as the lusty companion of Henry IV. Castelain expresses the typical attitude toward Bobadil in calling him "La plus amusante et la plus vivante silhouette que Jonson ait crayonnée."[6] J. B. Priestley expresses the view of all scholars who have shed critical tears over the degradation of Falstaff when he says, "The Falstaff I am discussing has nothing to do with the impostor, the up-river bully, the provincial dupe of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*."[7] Dowden, considering the Shakspere play itself as nothing but a grudging attempt on the dramatist's part to show Falstaff in love, according to royal instructions, expresses a similar view:

> "Falstaff he was not prepared to recall from heaven or from hell. He dressed up a fat rogue, brought forward for the occasion from the back premises of the poet's imagination in Falstaff's clothes."[8]

It is my view, however, that if Shakspere was not prepared to recall the genuine Falstaff from heaven or from hell, the impostor was not derived entirely "from the back regions of the poet's imagination." On the contrary, and in line with Shakspere's usual methods of composition, this Falstaff seems to have originated in his most recent acquaintance among the braggarts, "the inimitable Bobadil." If it is a coincidence, it is a striking one, that vanity, the very quality which is Bobadil's distinguishing characteristic, is the trait used to transform Falstaff from a clever, irrepressible rogue—he was always a parasite and a braggart—into the stupid gull of *MW*. If Falstaff had simply intended to sponge upon the jovial ladies as he had sponged upon Mistress Quickly, he would have been far more than a match for their wits. He could very easily have used them as his "exchequer" and his "region in Guianna." But he, of all people, the "tun of flesh," "the mountain of mummy," has suddenly become vain, as vain as Bobadil, of his "good parts." So certain has he become of his fascination for the ladies that he is duped by the grossest flattery from Mistress Quickly; and as soon as Mistress Page looks at him, he says that "she even now gave me good eyes too . . . did course o'er my exteriors with such a greedy intention that the appetite of her eye did seem to scorch me like a burning-glass."

Not only this, but his vanity gets the best of him three times, causing him to be "stewed in grease . . . thrown into the Thames and cooled, glowing hot . . . like a horseshoe," to be beaten "grieviously in the shape of a woman," and to be humiliated again as Herne the Hunter. No wonder we accept his own view of his transformation. "I must have laid my brain in the sun and dried it," he says, "that it wants matter to prevent so gross an o'er-reaching as this." Later he suspects, as we do, that his brain should be "ta'en out and buttered and gi'en to a dog for a New Year's gift."[9]

The essential difference between the two braggarts, ironically enough, is that where Falstaff verges toward the typically Jonsonian gull, Bobadil borders on the more varied, unpredictable character associated with Shakspere. After the first scene there is no uncertainty as to what Falstaff will do—or rather, as to what will be done to him. Like Mat-

thew and Stephen of *EMIH,* he functions more or less as a football dummy, a target for the attacks of others. Bobadil, on the other hand, though he is humiliated in the end, enjoys many triumphs, sponging completely upon Cob and so impressing the other gulls with his magnificence that they follow him around imitating his every word and gesture. Another bit of ironical interchange is apparent in the following quotations, which the reader may care to place. In the first, the character himself is speaking, replying with typical false modesty to the statement that he is fascinating. "Not I, I assure thee," he says. "Setting the attraction of my good parts aside, I have no other charms." In the second, a long suffering host is describing the activities of his guest: "And here's the jest, he is in love with ——— and calls her 'Mistress' . . . and the wenches, they do so jeer and tihee at him."

Turning now to the even more remarkable resemblance between Ford and Kitely, we note that their similarity has been observed by almost every critic dealing with either play. Although some have considered the likeness superficial, merely the co-incidental treatment of a common passion, the more typical attitude is expressed by Palmer, "Kitely is first cousin to Master Ford,"[10] and by Hart, who says of Ford's malady, "It is a jealousy so unjust and unreasoning that it recalls Kitely's in *Every Man In His Humour* more than any other creation I am aware of."[11]

To my mind, the similarity between them hinges upon two essential points, both integrally related to Jonson's *humour* theory.[12] First, the jealousy is regarded as a disease or abnormality, something to be cured. Knowell asks of Kitely's malady, "what lunacie is this that haunts this man?" and Kitely himself describes it as a disease which "like a pestilence . . . doth infect the houses of the braine." Kitely resolves to "shake the fever off that thus shakes me," but as the play proceeds his obsession grows steadily stronger, reaching the degree of neurosis in the dramatic scene of Act III where he resolves never to leave his wife unguarded. Later, still without the slightest grounds for suspicion, when Cob reports that a crowd of people are in his home, he demands, "which of them was it that first kist my wife?"

The jealousy of Ford, though accorded fewer soliloquies

and less careful analysis than that of Kitely, is likewise regarded as a neurosis. Mistress Ford tells us that it is not a newly acquired passion, aroused like that of Othello or Posthumus by the insinuations of a villain, but his habitual state when she says of Falstaff's letter, "This will give eternal food for his jealousy." Evans says of it, "Why this is lunatics. This is a mad dog." Page says, "I would not ha' your distemper in this kind for the wealth of Windsor Castle. You are not to go loose any longer, you must be pinioned." Ford himself recognizes that it is the desire to prove himself sane which motivates his frenzied attempts to find his wife guilty. "Who says this is improvident jealousy," he rationalizes. "My wife hath sent to him." In the end he admits that he has been possessed of a devil and is now cured.

The second distinguishing feature, that which differentiates the jealousy of Ford and Kitely from the suspicions of Othello and other jealous husbands, is its apparent isolation from love. Neither ever mentions his affection for his wife. Men of wealth, both of them, they regard their wives as part of property which must be protected. Kitely prizes his "treasure" because he imagines other men desire her, and for that reason only resolves not to leave her unguarded. Ford, whose rich coffers have attracted Falstaff and who is known to Pistol as "of substance good," also closely associates his wife and his ducats. For him as for Kitely, the "hell of having a false woman" is simply, "my bed shall be abused, my coffers ransacked." Though he has not the slightest cause for suspicion, Ford would "rather trust a Fleming with my butter, Parson Hugh the Welshman with my cheese . . . than my wife with herself."

The jealousy of each is motivated by vanity as well. "The hell of having a false woman" consists not in her loss of honor or chastity, but in the husband's being a "slave to fear"—fear that he will be a cuckold and have his "reputation gnawn at." Each, in contrast to Claudio, Posthumus, or Othello, is constantly concerned with what other people will think of him. Each "must set a face on't to the world," Kitely being afraid to turn Downright out of his house for fear of what people will say, and Ford resolving to "seek

out Falstaff" so that he will be "rather praised for this than mocked." Each is less concerned with being a cuckold than being called one. "I like not these terms," says Kitely, and "Death, these phrases are intolerable." "I shall not only receive this villainous wrong," says Ford, "but stand under the adoption of abominable terms . . . Cuckold! the devil himself hath not such a name."

The difference between the two characters seems to result largely from the different interests of the two dramatists, the more analytical ones of Jonson, and the more dramatic ones of Shakspere. Kitely's obsession has gone much further than Ford's. His brain has become "a mere hourglass for the running sands of barren suspicion," and he is no longer able to formulate a definite plan of action. All he can do when he suspects his wife is to set Cash to watch her and to make his own presence "an iron barre Twixt the conspiring notions of desire." Ford, on the contrary, though his jealousy is viewed as an obsession, enflamed but not caused by the tales of Nym and Pistol, is still able to think clearly and to act. Determined to "be revenged on Falstaff and laugh at Page," he formulates an elaborate intrigue and begins immediately to carry it out.

Kitely, in other words, is more interesting as a study in jealousy—nowhere could one find a more searching or elaborate analysis of the relation between jealousy, miserliness, and vanity than in *EMIH*—but Ford is more dynamic as a character. Shakpere seems to have recognized here, as he later fails to do in *Hamlet,* the dramatic dangers inherent in an overly introspective character. He subordinates and frequently sacrifices the psychological analysis which is Jonson's *fort* to dramatic method. A large part of what Jonson attains through long and frequent soliloquy Shakspere suggests by contrasting Ford with Page, by repeating the comments of other characters about him, and above all by showing him in action—bits of technique which Jonson finds it worthwhile to utilize when he revises *EMIH* in 1612.

Plot Structure

Although the details of story in the two plays are very different—so different that *EMIH* is by no means to be

considered a source of the *Merry Wives*,—the similarity of their plot structure is striking. Both deal in the main plot with a guller gulled and in the two subordinate ones, first with an elopement and second with the cure of a jealous husband. In the opening scene of *EMIH* Old Knowell makes plans for following his son to town and spying upon him, the remainder of the action being devoted to the turning of the tables upon him by his son and the intriguing servant, Musco-Brainworm. In the same way, the first scene of the *Merry Wives* presents the plans of the original schemer, Falstaff, the rest of the play showing his humiliation at the hands of Mistress Ford and Page, aided and abetted by his own servants or henchmen, Nym, Pistol, and Robin. In both plays the plotter reveals his plans by inadvisedly showing a letter to his servant.

In the elopement plot, Anne of the *Merry Wives,* like Hesperida-Bridget of the Jonson play, is wooed by several ridiculous suitors, at least one of whom is addicted to verse-making and carries on his courtship by book. She ends, also like Bridget, by eloping with a young student poet slightly above her in station, thus outwitting both the undesirable suitors and her parents as Hesperida outwits her suitors and tyrannical brother. In both cases, the elopement is not revealed until the climactic scene of the last act, where it contributes to the general discomfiture of the victims.

The interesting feature of this plot in Shakspere's play is that it does not in any way dominate the action, as the practice of his romantic comedies would lead us to expect. Instead of focusing attention upon the "love motive," investing Anne (Hesperida-Bridget) "with all the charm of Rosalind or Juliet," clothing the material with his distinctive "poetic language . . . and romantic atmosphere,"[14] Shakspere definitely subordinates these features to maintain the spirit of everyday English life and the unified comic tone of rollicking merriment. Indeed, he maintains the purely comic mood far more successfully than Jonson, and later when Jonson revises his play his most important changes are in this direction.

To be more specific, the courtship and elopement are introduced in the *Merry Wives* as in *EMIH* not for their own

romantic sakes but to serve two distinctly comic purposes: first, the introduction of amusing character types in the disappointed suitors, Caius and Slender (corresponding to Matthew and Bobadil of *EMIH*), and second, a contribution to the final gulling episode of intrigue comedy. The last scene of *Merry Wives,* though it opens on an alien note in the fairy-like atmosphere of the forest, quickly changes through the medium of the elopement and main plots to the customary disclosure-discomfiture scene of intrigue, the number of gulls almost equaling the traditional accumulation of corpses at the end of a revenge play.

In the second subordinate plot, the cure of a jealous husband, the resemblance, as we have shown, is even more notable. Here, as in the main plot, Shakspere's essential change, one which Jonson follows (as usual) in the revision, is to provide external motivation for Ford instead of having him motivated entirely from within, as is Kitely. Both Ford and Kitely fit into the guller-gulled motif by plotting against their wives (Ford far more ingeniously than the helpless Kitely, of course) and falling into their own traps. This, as deliberately intended, keeps their passion in the comic realm, a task by no means easy in dealing with jealousy.

Episodic scenes in both plays impede the action of the three main plots, and though in Shakspere's they are fewer in number they are just as loosely and carelessly related. The practice dueling scene in *Merry Wives,* for instance (II, iii), and indeed the whole dueling episode could be more advantageously cut out than the dueling episode and corresponding practice dueling scene (I, v) in *EMIH*. The inclusion of such episodes, as well as other evidence of unusually careless writing in Shakspere's play, suggests that his decision to use Jonson's simpler, more flexible plot structure was influenced by the necessity of writing rapidly to fulfill Elizabeth's royal command—perhaps, if tradition is correct, in two weeks. Plot and incident to him are more important than character, and not, as for Jonson, simply a pretext for studying *humour* characters or bringing together a set of amusing people. He does not follow what Herford and Simpson call Jonson's "most significant innovation" in "mak-

ing the exhibition of Humours the sole function of the plot."[15] If he too uses the intrigue plot structure as the means to an end, the end is not the portrayal of character, but simply the practical one of producing an actable play in a hurry.

To appreciate the full significance of Shakspere's use of Jonsonian plot structure, however, one must recall some of the specific features in his usual technique. The structure of nearly all of his comedies except the two farces, the *Comedy of Errors* and *The Taming of the Shrew*,[16] follows a familiar and well established pattern. The main line of action is more or less serious, involving usually a love affair with which we are sympathetic and for which we desire a happy ending. The genuine comic interest is subordinated to a sub-plot which parallels and frequently parodies the main one, as Elisabeth Woodbridge has clearly illustrated with the Touchstone-Audrey plot of *As You Like It*.[17]

The third act climax (the fourth act reversal and counter-plot, the fifth act final triumph and happy ending are familiar features of the main plot and occur frequently in the minor ones as well.

In Jonsonian intrigue comedy, on the other hand, of which *EMIH* is a complicated but typical example, we have almost a reverse situation. Not only is the comic interest dominant and the romantic distinctly subordinated, but there is no rising and falling action and, strictly speaking, no climax. The action proceeds steadily in a series of forward moving circles until it reaches a combination climax and dénouement in the fifth act. The characters, instead of constituting two contending forces as in serious drama or romantic comedy, are divided into a group of aggressors and more or less passive victims. "The resulting plot," as Miss Woodbridge says, "may be briefly described as a network of practical jokes . . . [making] the Shakespearean type of comedy and the Jonsonian type . . . about as near two extremes as can be imagined."[18]

Such is the structure not only of *EMIH* but also of *Merry Wives*—and it is the only instance of Shakspere's use of the purely intrigue plot in comedy! Called by Miss

Dunn "purely a comedy of intrigue, a kind of dramatized Jest Book incident,"[19] *Merry Wives* has for plot nothing more than a "network of practical jokes." There is no element of conflict, no rising or falling action, and except for the final gullings of act five, no climax. An intriguer, a braggart, a jealous husband, and numerous incidental characters are outwitted and humiliated; that is the extent of the action in both plays.

Miscellaneous Similarities

Concerning the choice of similar, frequently identical, current foibles for ridicule in the two plays, we can do no more than list a few important examples. The popular interest in heraldry is ridiculed in both by having a character trace his ancestry back to a line of fish. Shallow, whose coat of arms is a "dozen white luces," traces his back to pike, while Cob of *EMIH* traces his to herring, "the king of fish." Dueling likewise affords constant amusement, as does the popularity of Spanish dueling terms. In *EMIH* Bobadil's favorite words are "stoccato" and "passada," and Matthew in relating Downright's threat to cudgel him changes the term to *bastinado* "for my more grace." In *Merry Wives* (II, i) the Host continually repeats the word "cavalerio," and Shallow refers disparagingly to "your passes, stoccadoes." In the succeeding scene the Host says in equally mocking tones that he has come "to see thee fight, to see thee . . . foin; to see thee traverse; to see thee pass thy punto, thy stock, thy reverse, thy distance, thy montant."

Bobadil's pride in his dueling accomplishments is treated throughout the play and is more important in the climax of his humiliation. One of his best scenes is in Act I where he boasts of his skill and gives Matthew a lesson with bed staffs. A similar scene in *Merry Wives* (II, iii) shows Caius, also a coward, boasting and practising with his servant, Jack Rugby, the latter professing to know no more of the sport than Matthew.

Closely allied to the fad of dueling is the attempt of the government to prevent it,[20] and this too is ridiculed by both Jonson and Shakspere. Bobadil's flimsy excuse for not accepting Downright's challenge is "I had a warrant of the

peace served on me even now, as I came along by a water bearer." Justice Shallow, although his fingers still itch when he sees a sword out, is "sworn of the peace." His official if not primary purpose in coming to see the anticipated duel is "to prevent the affair and fetch you home."

Still another interest of the gentleman which figures largely in each play, sometimes being ridiculed and sometimes not, is the favorite English pastime of hunting. Page is constantly going hunting, returning from hunting, or inviting his friends to indulge. "I do invite you to-morrow morning to my house to breakfast," he says. "After we'll a-birding together. I have a fine hawk for the bush" (III, iv, 178). Stephen of *EMIH* is planning to take up hunting as part of his campaign to appear a gentleman. He has the hawk, the hood, and the bells, he says; all he lacks is "a book of instruction."

Jonson's ridicule of the widespread dependence upon such books of instruction is confined to this reference, but Shakspere mentions separately Slender's dependence upon his collection of sonnets and riddles, and Evans' need for a book on dueling. Other gentlemanly foibles which offer their share to the general amusement are the dabbling in poetry, the excessive use of oaths, and the affectation of melancholy. The ridicule of current stage language and customs should be mentioned also, though it is too characteristic of the dramatists in other plays to be very significant. In *EMIH* the old-fashioned taste of Matthew and Bobadil for *Hieronymo* is satirized, and in *Merry Wives* the line of Falstaff, "I will ensconce me behind the arras" is probably a thrust at the over-worked stage trick language. A similar thrust at both actors and audience appears in the reply of Mistress Page to Mistress Ford's instructions to remember her cue: "If I do not act it," she says, "hiss me."

By far the most significant foible ridiculed, however, is the current misunderstanding and misuse of the term *humour,* including its variations, choler, phlegm, etc. A good illustration occurs in the long discussion of it between Cob and Cash in *EMIH,* which ends with the definition of *humour* as "a monster bred in a man by selfe loue, and af-

fectation, and fed by folly." (III, i). The gulls use it constantly, of course, in an incorrect sense. Matthew says of the composition of his poem, "Fayth, I did it in a humor" (III, iv), and Bobadil uses it in the common, but according to Jonson incorrect, sense of inclination, "It was opposite to my humor" (IV, i). In the folio version the term is frequently substituted for such words as "disposition" or "inclination," showing that Jonson did not always employ his own restricted definition.

In the *Merry Wives* the term is so consistently ridiculed that many critics have regarded Nym as a caricature of Jonson. Nym seldom opens his mouth without using the word, and in I, iii all eight of his speeches contain it: "Is not the humor conceited?" he says. "The good humor is to steal at a minim's rest . . . Will that humour pass . . . The humour rises . . . Humour me the angels . . . I thank thee for that humour . . . I will run no base humour. Here take the humour-letter . . . My humour shall not cool." But Nym is not the only character who uses the word frequently and loosely. Mistress Quickly is constantly confusing the choleric humour with the melancholic or phlegmatic. When Caius loses his temper, she says, "I beseech you, be not so phlegmatic." Later, confusing the choleric with the melancholic, she says, "If he had been thoroughly moved, you should have heard him so loud and so melancholic." Evans says, "pless my soul! how full of cholers and of trembling of the mind—How melancholies I am" and "Pray you, let us not be laughing-stogs to other men's humours," (III, i). Again (III, iv) he says, "This is very fantastical humours and jealousies."

In some ways, with his pompous moralizing, his quoting of Latin when he can't speak good English, his entanglement in a duel, and this constant use of the term *humour,* Evans seems a more likely caricature of Jonson than Nym. He it is also who hears the Latin lesson of the little William [Shakspere?] in IV, iii, a scene which is obviously introduced for its own sake, as it retards the action and has no connection whatever with the plot.

. . . . . .

The evidence for the influence of *EMIH* upon *MW* is significant largely in its accumulation. From the Jonson

play in which he had recently acted, Shakspere seems to have taken the idea for his main plot of a guller gulled, as well as for his two subordinate plots of an elopement and the cure of a jealous husband. In Stephen and Kitely he seems to have found the germ of his two best characters; and in Bobadil, the suggestion for transforming Falstaff into the stupid gull of the buck basket and beating incidents. Similarly, with regard to details, he seems to have found good-natured ridicule of such current foibles as the middle class dependence upon books of instruction, the gentlemanly habit of dabbling in poetry, and the general misuse of the term *humour*. And most importantly, perhaps because the royal command necessitated rapid writing, he seems to have used Jonson's distinctive variety of play-writing, the relatively simple intrigue plot structure and the *humour* method of characterization.

All this, of course, is not and cannot be proof. Intriguing and instructive as any study of influence may be, its conclusions without external testimony must remain in the realm of probability, in the realm of what Aristotle would term "poetic" as opposed to "historical" truth. Common sense tells us that Shakspere was perfectly capable of writing the *Merry Wives* without the aid (or evil influence) of Jonson and that he might have found basically similar plots and characters, though hardly the accumulation, elsewhere in Elizabethan drama. But where certainty is not available, where it is as impossible to disprove influence as to prove it, the pragmatic approach to scholarship demands that we follow the evidence where it leads—and in this case the direction is clear.

---

[1]*Every Man In His Humour*. The abbreviation *EMIH* will be used throughout the article.

[2]George L. Kittredge, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, p. 63.

[3]The only important challenge to this date has come from Dr. Leslie Hotson, in his recent book, *Shakespeare Versus Shallow* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1931). Having accumulated considerable evidence for identifying Shallow with Justice Gardiner, a despicable politician and ancient enemy of the Lord Chamberlain's company, Hotson contends that since Gardiner died on November 26, 1597, and Shakspere would hardly have ridiculed a man recently deceased, 1597—probably April 23, the occasion of the Feast of the Garter—is the latest possible date.

But Hotson fails to show either that *MW* does not follow the *Henry IV* plays or that they have been incorrectly dated. Making no attempt to dispute the accepted evidence on these points, he merely states in view of his discoveries, "since it is

generally agreed that *Henry IV,* Part II, preceded the *Merry Wives,* the two parts of *Henry IV* must now be pushed back into the season of 1596-97." *op. cit.,* p. 130. . . . He refuses to recognize that if we are to assume Shakspere's delicacy about ridiculing the dead (a point of taste in which he must have been strangely ahead not only of his own time but of the eighteenth-century satirists and Lord Byron as well) we must not casually brush aside the date evidence for three plays but direct our questioning to the identification of Shallow with Gardiner.

[4]Thomas W. Baldwin, in *The Organization and Personnel of Shakespeare's Company,* p. 236 and 240, accepts Jonson's statement.

[5]The Relation of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* to Jonson's *Every Man In His Humour,* Part II. Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill, N. C., 1939.

[6]Maurice Castelain, *La Vie et l'oeuvre de Ben Jonson,* p. 224.

[7]J. B. Priestley, "Falstaff and his Circle," *The English Comic Characters,* p. 69.

[8]Edward Dowden, *Shakespeare: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (New York: 1881), p. 328.

[9]It must be admitted that Falstaff has one redeeming feature in *MW,* his occasional witty lines. As Moore expresses it, "In action Shakespeare disgraces him; but in word, Falstaff is still a prince." John B. Moore, *The Comic and the Realistic in English Drama,* p. 202.

[10]John Palmer, *Ben Jonson,* p. 35.

[11]H. C. Hart (ed.), *The Merry Wives of Windsor,* p. vii.

[12]According to his theoretical definition at least, Jonson seems to mean by the term *humour* not simply the dominant or distinctive trait of a character, but a trait which, like the physical humours or fluids, "wants power to contain itself." In other words, it is not the peculiarity or dominance of a trait which makes a *humour,* but the inability of the individual to control it. And the term, like the Aristotelian term *Katharsis,* is merely a metaphorical or figurative one when applied to drama.

[14]In the introduction to his edition of *Every Man In His Humour* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921), Henry H. Carter speculates hypothetically on how "Shakespeare would have employed the same material quite differently." The love motive, he says, "would have dominated the play . . . Bridget would have gained a fairer name and have been invested with all the charm of Rosalind or Juliet . . . Clothe this material in the poetic language of Shakespeare and surround it with the romantic atmosphere which only he could have created, and the play would easily become a canonical member of the Shakespearian group" (p. ciii).

[15]C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, *Ben Jonson,* I, 343.

[16]The essential difference between farce and intrigue comedy is that in the former most of the action results from chance, mistaken identity, confusion of time, etc., whereas in the latter it is carefully motivated and directed by a group of schemers. *The Taming of the Shrew* represents a combination of intrigue and farce. *The Comedy of Errors* in the body of the play is pure farce, but in the Aegeon framework, where a man's life is involved, it employs the high stakes and serious tone of romantic comedy.

[17]Elisabeth Woodbridge, *The Drama, Its Laws and Technique* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1898), p. 145. For my understanding of plot structure I have drawn heavily upon this book, as well as upon Miss Woodbridge's "Studies in Jonson's Comedy," (Boston, 1898). For a different, and in my opinion unsubstantiated, view of Jonsonian plot structure, see Edgar C. Knowlton, "The Plots of Ben Jonson," *MLN,* XLIV (1929), pp. 77ff.

[18]*The Drama; Its Laws and Technique,* p. 145.

[19]Esther G. Dunn, *Ben Jonson's Art,* p. 127.

[20]Particular interest attaches to this point because of its biographical associations. Jonson was constantly being fined or imprisoned for disturbing the peace (*EMIH* was probably written during his imprisonment for killing Gabriel Harvey in a duel), and the recent discoveries of Leslie Hotson have thrown a similar light on Shakspere. The court entry showing Shakspere "sworn of the peace" was the clue which led to all of Hotson's investigations.

PORTIA, DANIEL, SUSANNA

Editor of the Bulletin:

It was Macaulay who put it this way: "There is no controversy so idle that it may not be of use in exercising the faculties of the disputants."

Warned too late against the danger of going into the lion's den without the divine guidance, I went in. There were no lions at all, but perhaps by divine guidance I met in the path only a gentle scholar, Mr. Withington. Said he: "Portia was not really a judge—rather an attorney — but like Daniel (who was attorney for the defence, not a judge) she was interested in seeing justice done — in rescuing the weak from the strong."

Perhaps so, but this wasn't a criminal case; one party was a leading Christian merchant of Venice, the other a Jewish money-lender, both capitalists; the case had to do with a bond. Surely Portia came not as an Advocate retained by one of the parties; she came as a Judge "dressed like a doctor of laws" to pinch-hit for Bellario, a learned doctor whom the Duke had sent for "to determine this," but who reports himself as "very sick today." When she came in every one rose and bowed, the Duke told her to take her place. And she took the Judge's place, saying she was informed "throughly" of the cause but, pretending to be a stranger to the parties, called on both parties to state their positions. Here and in what follows is exemplified court procedure according to the civil law as that procedure was daily exemplified in the Archbishop of Canterbury's Prerogative Court and in the Court of Arches in Doctors' Commons, St. Paul's Churchyard, a few steps from Blackfriars Theatre. As the Italian courts in the middle and later centuries drew upon nearby universities for approved Doctors of Law to serve as Judges in important cases, so the Ecclesiastical Courts of England, following Roman civil practice, called on Oxford and Cambridge to supply them with accredited Doctors of Law for Judges. In London of the 16th century the extensive business of the Ecclesiastical Courts required resident Judges, hence Doctors' Commons; there since 1564 had lived the Doctors from the two Universities selected by the Archbishop for the canonical judicial career. The famous university at Padua was not far from Venice, and Doctor Bellario of Padua was the one usually called to the court at Venice. In theory the Duke presided in that court as the Archbishop did in the spiritual court, the judgments being officially entered and enforced in the name of the Duke or Archbishop.

The setting of the stage for Act IV, Scene 1, followed the advice of one or more of the scholarly residents of Doctors' Commons, and the Portia of 1596-7 wore a Judge's robe borrowed from the wardrobe of Doctors' Commons. The wearing of a robe by the Judge was essential, and its cut, material and fashion were prescribed by rule. Every one connected with the courts at Doctors' Commons wore the the distinctive robe of his rank. Nothing in "The Adventures of Giannetto," from the *Pecorone* of Fiorentino of 1378, furnished a guide for the formalities of Shakspere's Strict Court of Venice.

There was some telescoping. Ordinarily cases are argued by Advocates supported by Proctors. Drama required that Shylock and Antonio should each state his own case. The "lawyer's clerk" took up the slack of

Proctors and Advocates who would have slowed up the scene. You may be certain, however, that among the spectators on the stage of the Merchant of Venice, first in the Theatre and later in The Globe, were groups from Doctors' Commons, coming in on free passes, signed WS or JH.

Mr. Withington says Portia wasn't a Judge at all—she was attorney for the defence. Whither will this lead us?

If Portia was attorney for the defence, she gave Shylock the early impression that he was the oppressed client she came to rescue. It is he who gives her the addition—"A Daniel come to Judgment, yea, a Daniel." (Theobald thought the text should be corrected to "A Daniel! Come to judgment! Yea, a Daniel!") He adorns his Daniel with medals: "wise," "most reverend"; he honors her, he kisses the hem of her robe. Adopting the postulate and the argument of Mr. Withington, Shylock, conferring the title "Daniel" on(as he supposed) his defender, casts himself in the rôle of Susanna, the hapless victim haled into court and convicted on perjured testimony of an evil deed. Yet no one had haled Shylock into court; he was not even invited. He had crashed the gate, and in a raucous imperative voice which the tactful Duke couldn't soften, he was demanding the forefeiture of his bond and his pound o' flesh. He was not accused of anything—not yet. He had never heard of that pseudo-drama of Susanna with which the sacred Jewish text had been adulterated; the only Daniel he knew was the brave and skilful Daniel of the Hebrew-Aramaic text. After accepting her new honors from Shylock, Portia about-faces; she now warns Shylock that he will be guilty of a capital crime if he exercises the right which she has just said the law guaranteed him. The attorney abandons the client in the midst of the trial. The garrulous Gratiano mockingly chirps up, "a second Daniel." The rôle of Susanna is transferred to Antonio—under the Withington theory. New flaws now appear. No one, not even Shylock, is bearing false witness against Antonio. The smug merchant borrowed money for a wife-hunting friend. He gives a bond, with an improvident condition, to an enemy whom he had antagonized, not to say outraged. He has neither money nor credit nor a meritorious defence. He begged for mercy but there was no mercy. There is nothing left but to rail against the Jew. Portia has come to save him as little Jewish boy Daniel saved matron Susanna, as it is said, but little Daniel was neither a judge nor a lawyer; he was a spectator who, as convicted Susanna is being led away, makes bold to insist on asking the two witnesses separately under which tree they saw Susanna and her paramour, and when one witness said a mastic tree and the other said a holm tree, the case against Susanna collapsed, the conviction was reversed, Susanna declared innocent, and young Daniel became a popular hero. The case against Antonio collapsed when Judge Portia pronounced her decision which any lawyer will tell you was hocus-pocus.

My spirited and scholarly disputant belongs manifestly to the many-headed majority who, generation after generation, revere Portia as the Juno of Justice, the clear spirit of the lofty soul. In this he is a true Shakspirit, innately susceptible (like Ariel and all Globe theatre audiences) to the charm of Prospero and his magic robe.

In the Shakspere world, however, there is room for many views. There are those who see in Portia the glamorous humbug, her De Milo figure draped in borrowed and bespattered

ermine, her tongue of culture dripping lies, as she carries out the conspiracy to extricate her new uncle-in-law from the awful mess in which her spendthrift bridgeroom so irresponsibly left him. The indictment against Shylock is too long to read in full, Your Honor.

All this, however, is not to say that the Portia debunkers are not allergic to the beauty of speech and power of situation in *The Merchant of Venice*. Hazlitt did not think much of the mercy speech. No one would deny any one the right to an opinion about Portia. The argument which Mr. Withington is urging, as if it were a party line, and the argument that I think unsound, is that Shylock's calling Portia a Daniel integrates Susanna and the false witness and the Apocryphal Daniel into the play. And the assertion that all first-class commentators follow this line is questioned. Furness didn't follow it; he referred generally to all bible Daniels. Rolfe's footnote of 1880 did indeed escape me. Apparently Dover Wilson is inclined to adopt Susanna's Daniel. Herford is silent. Many first-class editors, like Neilson and Kittredge, are not footnoters.

If you're someone who needs must write illuminating footnotes to Shakspere, or you're someone who feels impelled to defend such footnoters, isn't it better not to nail your flag to a simple conjecture? Why not call attention to the Daniel verse in *Ezekiel*, the apocryphal Daniel, and any other Daniel that may or may not be relevant, leaving it to the readers to decide or not to decide, if the point interests them, as if they were audiences. Is it not a fair question also whether modern scholarship should undertake to blow-torch as an untutored heretic anyone who casts a pebble of interrogation or a glance of askance at a conjecture which someone dogmatically calls an inerrable finality?

JOHN E. HANNIGAN.